UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2939
14 September 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND THIRTY-NINTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 13 September 1990, at 10.35 p.m.

President:	Mr. VORONTSOV	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Daoyu
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. REDZUAN
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Zaire	Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

best copy available

The meeting was called to order at 10.35 p.m.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I should like to take this opportunity to pay a tribute, on behalf of the Council, to His Excellency Mr. Aurel Dragos Munteanu, Permanent Representative of Romania to the United Nations, for his competent and skilful guidance of the work of the Council in an extremely complicated and difficult period. His great diplomatic skill, competence and patience made it possible for the Council appropriately to respond to the situation that emerged in the Persian Gulf, a thorny issue which constitutes a threat to international peace and security.

I should also like to take the opportunity to extend a very warm welcome, on behalf of the Council, to Sir David Hannay, the new Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations. I am sure I speak for all members of the Council in wishing him every possible success.

I should like, too, at this official meeting of the Security Council to extend words of thanks to Sir Crispin Tickell, the former Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations, for the enormous contribution he made to the work of the Council.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAQ AND KUWAIT

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of Kuwait in which he requests to be invited to participate in discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the

(The President)

Council, to invite him to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have the following documents before them: S/21742/Rev.1, containing a draft resolution submitted by Cuba; and S/21747, containing a draft resolution submitted by Canada, Finland, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

READEX FICHE

(The President)

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolutions before it. If there is no objection, then in accordance with rule 32 of the provisional rules of procedure, which states:

"Principal motions and draft resolutions shall have precedence in the order of their submission",

I shall put the draft resolution contained in document S/21742/Rev.1 to the vote first.

There being no objection, it so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: China, Cuba, Yemen

Against: Canada, Finland, France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States

Abstaining: Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, Zaire

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The result of the voting is as follows: 3 votes in favour, 5 against and 7 abstentions.

The draft resolution has not been adopted, having failed to obtain the required number of votes.

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting on the draft resolution contained in document S/21742/Rev.1.

Mr. LI Daoyu (China) (interpretation from Chinese): At the outset, I wish to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council at a time when it is faced with critical problems, and wish you all success in your important work. I would also like to express my appreciation and thanks to Ambassador Munteanu of Romania for his skilful guidance of the Council's unprecedented work in the month of August.

(Mr. Li Daoyu, China)

I would also like to welcome warmly Sir David Hannay, the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, as he participates in the work of the Security Council and to extend to him my heartfelt congratulations.

The Chinese delegation voted in favour of the draft resolution proposed by Cuba entirely in the spirit of humanitarianism. We believe that the provision of foodstuffs to the civilian population and foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait should be carried out within the framework of Security Council resolution 661 (1990), that is, in humanitarian circumstances.

In order strictly to implement resolution 661 (1990), we are in favour of the adoption of a resolution by the Security Council to establish mechanisms of information seeking and food distribution, for that would help to solve the problems we are facing at present. The Chinese delegation's vote in favour of the draft resolution proposed by Cuba does not mean any change in our aforementioned position.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of China for the kind words he addressed to me.

The Council will now proceed to take a decision on the draft resolution contained in document S/21747.

I shall first call on those members who wish to explain their votes before the voting.

Mr. AL-ASHTAL (Yemen) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like at the outset to extend to you, Sir, our heartfelt congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month. I am confident that, with your great experience, you will successfully conduct the business of the Council. I am pleased that your country, the Soviet Union, is linked with mine by historic bonds of friendship.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

I should like to congratulate the Ambassador of Romania, Mr. Munteanu, who conducted the business of the Security Council at a difficult time. He did so successfully, as we all know. I should also like to welcome officially Sir David Hannay, the new Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom. I wish him all success in his work.

In the note verbale that I addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations in answer to his note No. SCPC/7/90(1) of 8 August 1990, related to the implementation of resolution 661 (1990), I conveyed the answer of the Government of Yemen to the issues raised in that note, as follows:

First, the Government of the Republic of Yemen, in recognition of its commitment under Article 25 of the Charter, and in view of the fact that resolution 661 (1990) is of a binding nature, is complying with the contents of that resolution, desiring as it does to make good its commitments under the United Nations Charter. It will take appropriate measures to implement it. The Government of Yemen's commitment to that resolution reflects its respect for and commitment to the Charter, despite the fact that the Republic of Yemen, as a member of the Security Council, did not support resolution 661 (1990) when it was adopted for reasons that I explained at that time and reaffirm here once again.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

Secondly, the Government of the Republic of Yemen affirms that it understands the interdiction detailed in paragraph 3 (c) of resolution 661 (1990) to exclude supplies intended for medical purposes and foodstuffs, which are considered, for humanitarian reasons, to be exempted from the embargo imposed against Iraq and Kuwait.

Therefore, our understanding of the provisions of resolution 661 (1990) is that we refuse to starve the weak and innocent in Iraq and Kuwait, including those of third countries, as a way to achieve political ends, since the use of such methods is in contradiction to many international humanitarian agreements prohibiting them, for such inhumane actions make victims of innocent civilians who have no part in the conflict. The implementation of such policies would have a deleterious effect on the civilian population, which would be directly affected by them, not to mention the fact that they might not have the effect of bringing Iraq to implement the resolutions of the Security Council but, on the contrary, only bring harm to innocent civilians.

Our observations with regard to the draft resolution submitted to the Council can be broken down into two parts. The first relate to the draft resolution as a whole, and the second to the detailed provisions set forth in the draft resolution.

With regard to the draft resolution as a whole, the Republic of Yemen believes that the draft resolution submitted to the Council is an attempt to deal with the humanitarian circumstances mentioned in resolution 661 (1990), but that it is the result of very narrow reasoning that could have unfortunate consequences and that does not serve our ultimate purpose, which is to find a political solution to the conflict between Iraq and Kuwait and to achieve implementation of United Nations resolutions.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

We believe that resolution 661 (1990), which the Council adopted on 6 August 1990, is the broadest resolution the Security Council has ever adopted in its history, imposing as it does a blockade against a State Member of the United Nations. That resolution covered all economic, service, trade and military aspects, and, judging from the response of Member States to the Security Council resolution and from their implementation of its provisions, it is clear that the resolution is a comprehensive one and that it has clearly expressed its purpose of seeking to have Iraq to abide by the Council's resolutions concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait.

The Republic of Yemen believes that the commitment of Member States to the provisions contained in resolution 661 (1990), in keeping with Article 25 of the Charter, and the high degree of compliance achieved in a very short time, as reflected by many official reports both inside and outside the United Nations, confirm that that commitment is effective and perhaps capable of achieving the purposes of resolution 661 (1990).

As for our detailed observations on the contents of the draft resolution, we would say the following:

First, the draft resolution requests that the Secretary-General seek information on a continuing basis from relevant United Nations and other appropriate humanitarian agencies and all other sources on the availability of food in Iraq and Kuwait. Such reports might well take a long time, given the fact that many such agencies are not now present in either Iraq or Kuwait. The replies the Committee has already received in response to resolution 661 (1990) confirm that problem. We encounter even greater difficulties when it comes to specifying the

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

categories in need of foodstuffs, and we cannot imagine how such information could be obtained in light of the fact that we are speaking of millions of human beings, Iraqi, Kuwaiti and nationals of third countries.

Secondly, even if information about the food situation were available to us, it is up to the Security Council or to the Committee established under resolution 661 (1990) to decide whether that information justifies the sending of foodstuffs to Iraq and Kuwait. This could result in wasting time. At present, as members know, we have the example concerning the sending of the Indian vessel.

Thirdly, if the Committee agrees to the sending of foodstuffs, an invitation would then be issued to international humanitarian organizations to provide foodstuffs to specified categories. We must therefore ask ourselves where those agencies would find the necessary food and who is going to pay for it, as well as how it will be transported and how long it will take to arrive if it is not to arrive too late. Given those questions, it is clear that the draft resolution we adopt must be viewed in the light of reality, because it relates directly to the lives of millions of people, Iraqi and Kuwaiti, as well as citizens of third countries. In this connection it may be important to note that Jordan, against which no embargo has been imposed, which has been harmed through the implementation of resolution 661 (1990) and with which many countries have expressed their solidarity, has continued its help in the crisis that has now lasted for over a month and that its request for assistance is still under consideration.

Fourthly, we cannot imagine how international agencies can distribute foodstuffs to certain categories in Iraq and Kuwait while completely bypassing the participation of the country concerned.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

Fifthly, the draft resolution purposely excludes any bilateral humanitarian efforts to send foodstuffs to Iraq and Kuwait. Here, I would note that the Government of Iraq has officially stated that it will not allow international humanitarian agencies to transport or distribute foodstuffs themselves and that it will deal only on a bilateral basis.

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

In that case, we wonder how this draft resolution would lead to the safeguarding of the interests of millions of Kuwaitis and Iraqis, as well as nationals of other countries, who will have been subjected to starvation or disease in a few weeks. We really wonder whether the Security Council would wish these persons to be in such difficulties because of a lack of foodstuffs, water and medicine.

We know that the intention of this draft resolution is to press the Government of Iraq to implement Security Council resolution 661 (1990). We have committed ourselves to the implementation of that resolution. That would be a peaceful way of settling the conflict; that is true. But how are we to explain the position of the Security Council, which goes on insisting even though it knows that the Government of Iraq will not accept help from international organizations and that such help will not be distributed to the needy.

We wonder how the Council can submit a draft resolution that does not allow even the slightest bilateral co-operation, which might be a way out of difficult circumstances, which might help persons who are falling victim to starvation.

In this connection, I wish to thank the sponsors of the draft resolution for accepting the latest amendment, under which the Secretary-General is requested to use his good offices to facilitate the delivery and distribution of foodstuffs to Kuwait and Iraq. We believe that the delivery and distribution of foodstuffs to Kuwait and Iraq could constitute one of the small ways out of the danger of starvation.

As the Council is about to vote on this draft resolution, we call attention to the great danger to which it will expose millions of innocent persons. We call upon the Security Council, even if this draft resolution is adopted, to consider at an appropriate time ways for bringing food to these people. Surely the Council

(Mr. Al-Ashtal, Yemen)

does not wish to take the responsibility of exposing these persons to disease and starvation. For if that were to happen we should not blame the Government of Iraq; we would have to bear part of the responsibility.

It was wise to exempt foodstuffs and medicines, in humanitarian circumstances, from the provisions of resolution 661 (1990). I think that that resolution must be implemented in a very humane way if it is to achieve its purposes.

I wish to state once again on this occasion that the Republic of Yemen cannot support any draft resolution, any proposal or any position that would lead ultimately to the starvation of the nationals of an Arab nation, including children, old people and women. That is a position we take regarding all peoples, all over the world, who suffer from starvation and disease. The Republic of Yemen categorically rejects the use of any means to starve innocent nationals of Iraq and Kuwait, or the nationals of any other countries, in order to serve certain political purposes - no matter how noble they might be. We believe that what is most noble is to ensure the survival of human beings and to safeguard the well being and the rights of mankind.

At the same time, I should like to state again this position of the Republic of Yemen - a position that has been affirmed time and again in the Security Council: The conflict between these two brother countries, Iraq and Kuwait, can be solved only by peaceful means. We confirm that we shall continue our efforts to contain the crisis between these brother countries. The Government of the Republic of Yemen believes that the most effective and appropriate way of dealing with and ending this crisis is to solve it peacefully within the Arab framework.

For all those reasons, the delegation of the Republic of Yemen will not vote in favour of the present draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Yemen for the kind words addressed to me.

Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): I wish first to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of September. I wish also to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Romania on the way in which he conducted the complicated work that faced the Council last month.

We wish to welcome the new representative of the United Kingdom as he takes up his work in the Security Council.

My delegation is pleased to see you, Sir, presiding over the Security Council, not only because we are aware of your professional qualities as a diplomat, which will certainly contribute to our work, but also because you represent a country - the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics - that is united to mine by deep-seated ties of brotherhood and friendship. The Cuban people will be for ever grateful to the Soviet people, to its Government and its Party for the co-operation they extended to us at the very beginning, when my country had to confront a ferocious and tenacious economic, trade and financial blockade. That blockade has been in force for almost 30 years now. Of course, it includes a total denial of any possibility of access to the markets of foodstuffs, medicine or medical supplies of the country that is illegally imposing that blockade.

Thus, we are very familiar with the subject now before the Security Council. That is why we have various reasons for not being in agreement with the draft resolution submitted to the Council in document S/21747. Cuba regards as completely inadmissible the very idea of claiming that hunger can be used to deprive peoples of what is an absolutely fundamental right of every single human being in every part of the world and in any circumstances - that is, the right to receive adequate food and appropriate medical care.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

We do not believe that anyone has the political, juridical or moral authority to apply any inhuman measures such as those whose sole and exclusive victims would be innocent civilians. And that is what we are now concerned with here.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

Moreover we must recall that this draft resolution has been put before us in a given context. It has its own history. The Security Council was able to act expeditiously and with singular energy when it adopted sanctions more compehensive than any that had ever been envisaged against Iraq and Kuwait. It acted equally hastily in adopting a resolution whose legality is at the very least open to question, or, to be more accurate, a resolution that entirely violates our Organization's Charter, and in resolution 665 (1990) enables continued exercise and deployment of military force in the Gulf region to impose, even by force, the total sanctions that had been imposed against Iraq and Kuwait.

But resolution 661 (1990) at least contained reference to the possibility of supplying foodstuffs in humanitarian circumstances. Practically since the day it was adopted - or, to be more specific, since the establishment of the Committee on Sanctions - we have spent countless hours trying to define the criteria the Council should follow in interpreting clauses of resolution 661 (1990).

While that was occurring, the Council received information from various sources as to the consequences for thousands and thousands of innocent individuals, first and foremost the citizens of Kuwait, a country that has fallen victim to a circumstance we have condemned and rejected. We continue to call for an immediate solution to that situation. Furthermore, punished by the Security Council, and now even more with these new measures, are the people of Iraq and the nationals of many other States present on Iraqi or Kuwaiti territory.

Every day in more alarming terms there are reports concerning the situation confronting the populations there. Even had we not been informed in this regard by the mass media, the Council has received more than one communication calling for the adoption of urgent measures to keep people from dying for lack of foodstuffs. We have read the letters from the Ambassadors of India, the Philippines and other countries. They have called upon this body, which was not compelled to adopt

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

resolution 661 (1990), in a spirit of humanitarianism to deal with the situation in which their innocent civilians find themselves. Not only has the Security Council not responded to those appeals; it is now invited to adopt a draft resolution that would basically make even more difficult and distant the possibility of hoping any real substance can be given to our so-called humanitarian premises.

The draft resolution submitted to us does not explain to us what will happen to the 100,000 Sri Lankans that have been trapped on Kuwaiti territory, and no one has even suggested how they can receive foodstuffs. The Security Council will now establish machinery that is not urgent and not motivated by the anxiety and haste that caused us to spend so many nights in this Chamber in August but by exemplary patience and singular tranquillity at a time when we are dealing with human suffering.

First of all we would entrust the Secretary-General with the task of urgently finding information on the situation regarding the availability of foodstuffs in Kuwait. And the Secretary-General, as we all know, has reported to members of the Council on the difficulties the Organization is having in the field and the fact that it basically has no representation there in a position to shoulder responsibilities, particularly those that would flow from this text.

On the basis of that information the Committee would proceed to analyse the resultant data with a view to determining whether or not there exist circumstances indicating it is of utmost urgency that Kuwait be given humanitarian aid. As a result, not foodstuffs but information would be produced, and I expect that information would come to the Council. But nowhere in the text is there even a suggestion as to what this Council would do to find ways and means of ensuring help for the nationals of third countries, and those of Kuwait, to whom no specific reference appears in the text we are invited to adopt but whom this Council prefers to reject. Nor is there mention of Iraqi citizens.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

We might envisage that, beginning now, the Council would resume the spirit of those moments in August and begin precipitously dealing with these very serious problems now confronting so many innocent people. Frankly, I see no special reasons for feeling enthusiastic about that possibility, because this very Council has also received a series of urgent requests under Article 50 of the Charter that we adopt decisions that would help alleviate the serious problems confronting countries other than those we have mentioned. To date, the list includes 10 Member States of our Organization, with Jordan at the top of the list. The moment is drawing near when a context unlike the previous one will be created.

Soon a month will have passed since the Permanent Representative of Jordan, in a well documented communication, told the Council about the very serious economic and social consequences for his country of the sanctions established in resolution 661 (1990). If the Council were finally able to adopt a resolution regarding Jordan, which is not as yet clear to my delegation, we should finally be able to show some kind of concern about the case we all acknowledge to be the gravest of all, and be serious.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

I cannot be very encouraging about the others on the list, whose cases we have not even had a chance to consider yet. I believe this Council's moral responsibility is great. On the one hand, it is right that we should all try to ensure full implementation of the Council's resolutions adopted on the basis of resolution 660 (1990), which calls for an end to the conflict in the region, and that, through the Committee, we monitor implementation of the sanctions, ensuring their complete implementation as they were conceived in the text of the resolution. But I also think the Council must act with maturity and responsibility.

The annals of this Organization are perfectly well known. The hour is too late for me to take the Council through the lengthy list of countries that were represented here when the Council or the General Assembly discussed the question of economic sanctions in the past. Any case we might choose at random would clearly demonstrate that there was painstaking care before the adoption of any decision to take into consideration the economic consequences that decision might entail.

In certain cases, such as the lengthy history of South Africa, there is an inexhaustible store of quotations from some permanent members of the Council, even very recent quotations, in which they tried to explain that economic sanctions should not be imposed against South Africa because these would also harm the country's black majority. I know that our colleagues from the United States and the United Kingdom are very familiar with that position, because it is one they consistently maintained for many years; they continue to maintain it to some extent.

When some economic sanctions were imposed against Southern Rhodesia - not a third-world country or a poor country, but a wealthy developed country like the United States - the United States felt it had to violate them by continuing to import chromium from Southern Rhodesia. And the Security Council sitting in this

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

very Chamber sent no fleets; it adopted no condemnatory resolutions. It seemingly considered it natural that the representative of the United States should speak in this manner:

(spoke in English)

"The United States representative explained that the decision to resume imports of Southern Rhodesian chrome had been prompted by genuine considerations of United States national security and by its requirements of materials of strategic importance which could not be obtained cheaper anywhere else".

(continued in Spanish)

Can you imagine, fellow representatives, if any State in the world were today to apply the same logic to the oil for which we now have to pay at least double the price we were paying before this crisis? This is not a strategic material for anyone; none among the 10 representatives that have communicated with the Council under Article 50 has mentioned it. But in the prehistoric document from which I quoted it was natural for a great Power to tell the Security Council that it had decided to continue to buy chromium, despite the ban, because it could not find it cheaper elsewhere. Another quotation:

(spoke in English)

"He pointed out the United States imports of strategic materials from Southern Rhodesia amounted to only 2 per cent of the Territory's total exports of those commodities".

(continued in Spanish)

It was in 1972 that the then Permanent Representative of the United States told that to the Security Council. The Council adopted no special measures, and the import of chromium continued. The following year the representative of the United States again explained his country's position:

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

(spoke in English)

"The United States representative objected to the fact that many speakers had singled out his Government for blame as a violator of sanctions. He emphasized that although the United States had authorized the importation of chrome from Southern Rhodesia such imports constituted only 5 per cent of that Territory's annual exports".

(continued in Spanish)

One year it had been 2 per cent; the following year it was 5 per cent. Still, it was a figure that was more or less acceptable to the Council and the imports continued for as long as the United States Government felt them advisable.

There are many references I could cite; some of them concern the arms embargo against South Africa. Some time after the embargo was adopted by the Security Council, the representative of the same country explained why the United States continued to send arms to South Africa, and the explanation was apparently satisfactory at the time:

(spoke in English)

"Current deliveries of arms to South Africa, he said, consisted entirely of spare parts supplied under contracts made before 31 December 1963, the effective date of the United Nations embargo".

(continued in Spanish)

Can you imagine what would take place in the sanctions Committee if any country on Earth dared say it was delivering exports to Iraq or Kuwait because the contracts were made before the date sanctions were adopted? I think the first to leap up and call this a clear violation of the sanctions would be the very country that was able to be so flexible when commercial advantages or contracts it felt must be respected were at stake.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

I want to say that if this Council were in the future to deem it necessary to impose sanctions with the same strictness and stubbornness that have marked this case - comparable to no previous case in the Organization's history: the Council has never taken such action before - it should at least be obliged to foresee the consequences its decision might entail for other States not the object of the sanctions and for millions of individuals who, because they live in the area of the conflict, could suffer grave consequences. If such foresight were impossible because the sanctions resolution had to be adopted within a few hours, the world might at least expect that in the course of the following month we would be able to adopt a consistent position on the problems arising from the implementation of our decisions.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

My delegation considers that the contrary has occurred. The Council has been compelled - for reasons that we all know, which I need not repeat here - to follow one course of action and one alone. But something has occurred that my delegation frankly finds irritating.

In the course of the past week - I am revealing no secret. I think that all of us in this building know what happened in the sanctions Committee. We all know about the lengthy consultations that were held on the communications that had been received from the Ambassadors of India and the Philippines on the one hand, and Sri Lanka on the other, about the efforts that should be made to take rapid steps, at least with regard to the specific requests that we had received, and how, by some strange twist of fate, what began with what seemed to be a very simple discussion about whether we would authorize an Indian vessel to deliver foodstuffs that were urgently required by the Indian population in the region or not. And now we find the text before us.

That is what occurred though the Council and its Committee did have background information, not from ancient history but from recent days, as to how such questions should be settled when requests came not from third world countries but from other States.

Everyone knows that when authorization was requested to fly the aircraft of some members of the Council to pick up nationals of their countries that wished to return to their country of origin, or to fly Iraqi airplanes to do the same, there were no long negotiations, lengthy discussions or complicated texts. The sanctions Committee quickly and simply expressed agreement to such operations. We did it once, and since then it has recurred without the Committee having to meet again.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

My delegation entirely agrees with that interpretation of the request that was received at that time, if I am not mistaken, from the United Kingdom. I expect that in the carrying out of such activities there had to be communication with the Iraqi authorities and there had to be some financial payments, because finally one must pay for overflight airport services.

But when India comes and tells us that tens of thousands of its nationals are languishing in a situation in which they lack foodstuffs, and they tell us that they have a vessel that stands ready and loaded with foodstuffs to send to Kuwait, we then become involved in the most complicated negotiations simply to authorize India to send one vessel to Kuwait to deliver foodstuffs to those individuals.

It would involve no financial transaction to benefit Iraq, but it might help save some innocent persons who have the right to live and who, inter alia, are foreign to the parties in conflict. I wonder whether it is really fair for us to be so painstaking with regard to the drama of people of the developed countries, the countries of the north, while we remain impassive before the clamour of hundreds of thousands of individuals whose names appear nowhere in the big newspapers, whose stories have not been disseminated, but who, in the view of our delegation, have precisely the same rights as those from the wealthier countries, or who obviously bear more useful passports.

Of course, my delegation cannot say that the Security Council is acting in a discriminating fashion with regard to the various parties. We might have thought that one month later the Security Council would at least be in a position to deal with these problems and be responding to one or more of the cases of which we were notified. But we find an even worse situation.

A draft resolution has been put before us by which we would in fact extend and reinforce the sanctions against Kuwait and Iraq to include foodstuffs. That means

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

our taking a tortuous path with regard to imperative needs and requests for food received from various Member States. This indeed may be the point of no return.

It has been said on a previous occasion, as it is now, that it is justifiable to take such drastic measures and be cold in the fact of human suffering to ensure that measures are taken and objectives reached. But East Jerusalem was also occupied and annexed by an occupying Power. The Golan Heights was and continues to be annexed by an occupying Power.

That is not pre-history. It is a present fact. But there is no talk about that; there is no talk about sanctions; there is no talk of measures to force the occupier of those two territories, whose name is perfectly familiar to the members of the Council, to abide by the decisions of this same body.

I have quoted some material about South Africa. That is also pre-history. At this very moment the General Assembly is considering a report from the Secretary-General on the implementation of the Declaration adopted by consensus only a few months ago. At this very moment. This is not pre-history. Tomorrow the debate will continue here in this building, and, as the Secretary-General knows full well, his report contains information and replies from Member States that certainly do not indicate they are complying or will continue to comply with the sanctions against South Africa. Rather what the General Assembly is facing today - and our African brothers know this full well - is the dangerous tendency to water-down the policy of sanctions against South Africa, to try to undermine the position of the international community against apartheid and to seek measures of accommodation with the Pretoria régime before the General Assembly and Security Council resolutions are complied with.

But it was also this very Council that established the Committee to monitor the implementation of the sanctions adopted in resolution 421 (1977), and everyone knows that that Committee has been sleeping the sleep of the just for approximately

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

two months. Why? Because we had to concentrate on the real sanctions, sanctions there was a wish to apply, sanctions that, come what may, will cost the lives that they will cost. We cannot accept this approach. And this is not pre-history. We believe that if we are to have a minimum of consistency we must remember the possibility of rescuing from almost certain death that other sanctions committee and that other set of partial sanctions with regard to weapons alone that this Council decided on in the case of South Africa.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

My delegation firmly believes that the conflict that has arisen through the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq must be settled by means of the immediate and unconditional withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait. We firmly believe that the full sovereignty, territorial integrity and independence of Kuwait must be restored immediately. We believe that the third-State nationals in Iraq or Kuwait have rights that no one should abrogate, limit or affect, such as the right to exit and return to their country, the right to adequate foodstuffs, and all of the conditions inherent in a dignified life. But we also believe that equal rights are possessed by the people of Kuwait, the civilian population of Iraq, and the third-State nationals in the region, although those third States have the ill fortune of belonging to the third world rather than the rich world.

We are not prepared to support any action that would continue to ignore the tragedy for which those who originally caused this conflict are responsible. But the Security Council is also responsible, since it adopted the measures that it did, and did not take into consideration the problems it was creating for innocent people in so doing.

That is why we had put forward a draft resolution that we believed would enjoy the Council's approval. It will be seen that, except for some textual quotations from the Charter of the Organization, it flagged a principle which, while it did not receive the necessary votes, none the less continues to be a principle that no one has the right to flout - the principle that access to basic foodstuffs and to adequate medical assistance is a fundamental human right to be protected under all circumstances.

Since it will henceforth be increasingly difficult for millions of innocent individuals to exercise that right, and since, far from mitigating the suffering of individuals the Council's decision would instead perhaps increase it, my delegation is unable to vote in favour of the draft resolution that has been submitted.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Cuba for his kind words addressed to my country and to me personally.

I shall now put the draft resolution contained in document S/21747 to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

Against: Cuba, Yemen

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The result of the vote is as follows: 13 votes in favour, 2 against and no abstentions. The draft resolution has been adopted as resolution 666 (1990).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): First, I should like to bid you welcome, Sir, and extend our good wishes to you as you take up your duties as President of the Council. I should also like to thank and congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Munteanu of Romania, for the difficult and arduous but successful work he did in the month of August. I would like to join others in bidding warm welcome to the new Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Sir David Hannay, and through him to thank once again his predecessor, Sir Crispin Tickell.

Tonight, the behaviour of the Government of Iraq has caused the Council the make a difficult decision. The Iraqi Government has now escalated again its measures against innocent civilians. Following its invasion of Kuwait, it has separated Western males from their families and sent them as human shields to Iraqi

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

strategic installations. Iraq has cut off food, water and power for embassies in Kuwait and prevented diplomatic personnel from maintaining contact with their citizens in Kuwait. Iraq has now set a policy of holding those most vulnerable as hostage, hoping to blackmail other States into accepting its illegal occupation and annexation of Kuwait.

Today's crisis has been caused by Iraq's decision to widen the scope of its perfidy by a deliberate policy of starving over 100,000 citizens of India, Sri Lanka and the Philippines. Iraq has continued to tell us it has adequate food. Its announced policy is to feed first its military, and its actual practice is to create conditions of famine for foreign nationals trapped in occupied Kuwait. Let us make no mistake about the purpose: Iraq wants us to accept its ruthless aggression against Kuwait or accept the starvation of innocent civilians. We will do neither. Let those people go. It is the only real answer. And do it now.

The action of the Council stands in stark contrast to Iraq's policies. Far from using the plight of the most vulnerable as an opportunity for blackmail, far even from indifference to the condition of the civilian population in Kuwait and Iraq, the Security Council has adopted in resolution 666 (1990) a fair procedure that, if not rejected by Iraq, will allow for food and medical supplies essential to the well-being of civilians to reach them. Let us once again say to the Government of Iraq: let international humanitarian agencies do their work.

The United States has voted in favour of resolution 666 (1990) because it guarantees the integrity of United Nations efforts to end Iraq's occupation of Kuwait by peaceful means. Since 2 August, the members of the Security Council have worked together to repel the aggression against Kuwait and to define a new era of international co-operation under the Charter. Resolution 666 (1990) is additional proof that the international community is determined to stay the course in rejecting Iraq's occupation of Kuwait.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Today's resolution gives the sanctions Committee a strong mandate to support the work of the Security Council in applying sanctions against Iraq. It establishes a process that includes consideration by the Committee of the food situation inside Iraq and Kuwait. It points out the need to pay particular attention to the needs of vulnerable groups within society - children, mothers, the sick and elderly. It sets out a procedure for the distribution of relief supplies of food to be supervized by appropriate humanitarian agencies. And it emphasizes that medical supplies are to be provided only under the strict supervision of the Government of the country from which they were exported.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

My Government would like to emphasize that these safeguards are essential, not optional. The Iraqi Government continues to defy other resolutions of the Council which demand Iraqi withdrawal from Kuwait, establish sanctions against Iraq, nullify Iraq's purported annexation of Kuwait and demand respect for diplomatic missions in Kuwait and for foreign nationals. To speak clearly, the Council cannot count on the good faith of the Iraqi Government. Furthermore, the Iraqi Government has stated that in allocating food resources it intends to give first priority not to the needy but to the greedy, the looting army it has sent to Kuwait. Iraq has so far refused co-operation with humanitarian agencies. For these reasons it became incumbent upon the members of the Council, in promoting the effectiveness of its sanctions against Iraq, to lay down procedures to ensure that food supplies reach those for whom they are intended.

The resolution just adopted meets those needs. It gives a strong role to the sanctions Committee in implementing the policies of the Security Council. It ensures that the international community is prepared to respond to cases of genuine human need in a way that meets those needs without destroying the strength of the sanctions. In short, the mechanisms established in the resolution affirm both the genuine humanitarian concern of the members of the Council for the condition of civilians, whether Iraqi or Kuwaiti or third-country nationals, and the determination of the Council to stand firmly behind the sanctions designed to secure Iraq's withdrawal from Kuwait.

Now let me say a word about the draft resolution not adopted by the Council this evening. While it sought to address the problem of humanitarian concerns, it sought to ignore the clear terms of resolution 661 (1990) and the choice made by the Council in favour of economic sanctions as the response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait. Rather than seeking to strengthen the sanctions by ensuring that the

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

legitimate needs of the civilian population were met, it would have discredited sanctions as the chosen instrument of the Council, and my Government could not accept such a course.

In line with the resolution just adopted the sanctions Committee has approved the sailing of a ship from India to Kuwait with food to assist Indian and other nationals in Kuwait and Iraq. Let us be frank: there is food in Kuwait and Iraq. We have heard so from Iraqi authorities. But the Iraqi authorities have also chosen to deprive the most vulnerable elements of the civilian society, pushing them to the brink of starvation. The Iraqi Government evidently considers those individuals to be expendable, but the members of the Council clearly do not. We will be watching closely Iraqi performance as Indian authorities and appropriate humanitarian agencies work to distribute this food shipment to Indian and other nationals.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of the United States of America for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. LI Daoyu (China)(interpretation from Chinese): In recent days the Committee established under Security Council resolution 661 (1990) has conducted several rounds of discussions on the question of delivering foodstuffs to Iraq in humanitarian circumstances. Either during the Committee sessions or at other consultations the Chinese delegation has made the following its point of departure: First, resolution 661 (1990) must be strictly implemented so as to urge Iraq to comply with resolution 660 (1990), thereby paving the way for a political settlement of the current Gulf crisis and restoring peace in that region. Secondly, no situation should occur in which Iraqi and Kuwaiti residents and foreign nationals in these two countries, particularly children, will suffer from hunger. This position is consistent with the relevant provisions of resolution

(Mr. Li Daoyu, China)

661 (1990). Proceeding from that position, we found the draft resolution before us generally acceptable and we thus voted in favour of it.

We feel it necessary to point out that the mechanisms of information-seeking and food-distribution needed in providing food in humanitarian circumstances, as provided in the resolution just adopted, should in no circumstances cause any impediment or delay in the delivery of food. It should also be pointed out that the situation with which we are now faced is a highly special and urgent one. In the course of implementing the resolution we must be prepared to take whatever emergency measures are necessary in light of the actual situation. The critical predicament faced by Asian nationals in Iraq and Kuwait right now is a typical case in point. To prevent further worsening of their plight, which could be to the point of endangering their lives, it is imperative for the Security Council and its affiliated sanctions Committee to solve this type of problems as priority items without delay. In the same spirit we endorse the draft statement proposed by the non-aligned members of the Council.

I wish to emphasize that the question of food bears directly on the survival and well-being of hundreds of thousands of people. Therefore, in handling this kind of humanitarian question, it is necessary to stress higher efficiency and simpler formality.

Finally, I wish to express our hope that the Iraqi Government will seriously implement this resolution and co-operate with the countries and humanitarian organizations concerned during the shipping and distribution of foodstuffs in humanitarian circumstances.

Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI (Zaire)(interpretation from French): I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your country's assumption of the Presidency of the Council for this month. I should also like to

(Mr. Lukabu Khabouji N'Zaji, Zaire)

take this opportunity to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Romania, who conducted the Council's extremely difficult work during the month of August.

Allow me also to take this opportunity to welcome the new Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Sir David Hannay, and to tell him how very pleased we are to co-operate with him and to assure him that he can rely upon my delegation. I should also like to ask him to transmit our respects to his predecessor, Sir Crispin Tickell.

Once again my delegation is speaking in the Security Council to express its deep disappointment and to note that the situation in the Persian Gulf is far from a return to normal. The Council has already adopted five resolutions on the situation. A few moments ago we added a sixth to that list. Resolution 666 (1990), on which my delegation voted in favour, clearly expressed the concerns of the international community at the situation in which thousands of individuals are involved.

(Mr. Lukabu Khabouji N'zaji, Zaire)

These workers, from all over, who only yesterday, by dint of their intellectual and physical energy, were contributing to the prosperity of the Gulf region, have now been reduced to the condition of animals - and that is the fault of a full-fledged Member State of the Organization that invaded and annexed another Member State of the same Organization, Kuwait.

To each action undertaken by the Council in the quest for a solution to the Gulf crisis, Iraq replies with insolence and measures of intimidation. Zaire, in voting in favour of resolution 666 (1990), wished to express its sympathy for the suffering endured by the foreign populations in Kuwait and Iraq, deprived of their most elementary right - the right of access to enough food.

By this resolution 666 (1990) the Council has demonstrated that, despite the embargo decreed by resolution 661 (1990), the Council remains aware of and attentive to the humanitarian questions which could arise from the strict application of the sanctions decreed against Iraq by the Council.

Zaire believes that the context of humanitarian operations that the Council has just charted will serve to alleviate the suffering imposed upon the foreign populations living in Iraq and Kuwait. Thus, for humanitarian reasons, foodstuffs and medical supplies will be directed towards those populations, and particularly the most vulnerable sectors, such as children and pregnant and nursing women, as well as the sick and the elderly.

Zaire still believes that the solutions envisaged in resolution 666 (1990) will not suffice to eradicate all the effects of the crisis. That is why we state again that the solution to the crisis lies not in dealing with the effects but, rather, in uprooting the real cause. My delegation believes that the perverse effects of the crisis will disappear only when Iraq complies with resolution 660 (1990), which demands that Iraq withdraw unconditionally from Kuwait and restore the legitimacy of the national Kuwaiti institutions.

(Mr. Lukabu Khabouji N'zaji, Zaire)

I take this opportunity to express to all the members of the Council gathered here our gratitude for their having agreed to the adoption - although informal so far - of the statement designed to respond to the requests submitted by India, Sri Lanka and the Philippines.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Zaire for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): Allow me first, Sir, warmly to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of this very important organ of the United Nations. Aware as we are of your abilities and wide diplomatic experience, we remain convinced that the work of our Council will be crowned with success.

Our sincere appreciation goes to your predecessor, the Permanent Representative of Romania, for having so ably guided the work of the Council last month - a busy and indeed difficult month.

May I also take this opportunity warmly to welcome to our midst the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Ambassador David Hannay, and to wish him success.

The Ethiopian delegation shares the humanitarian concerns relating to the implementation of Security Council resolution 661 (1990). Our position regarding conditions under humanitarian circumstances is clear. We fully subscribe to the Council's stated position that it has no intention whatsoever of causing any hardship to innocent people - least of all to those from countries complying with the resolutions of the Security Council. Neither is it the intention of the Council to create a situation of suffering for the civilian populations in Iraq and Kuwait. Nor do we ever wish, in particular, the nationals from third countries to become victims of such situations.

It is our position that, as is clearly stated in resolution 661 (1990), foodstuffs should be provided in humanitarian circumstances without the slightest

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

delay. In this spirit, we strongly believe that the requests of countries whose nationals are stranded in Iraq and Kuwait should be addressed with the urgency they rightfully deserve.

It is therefore our ardent hope that resolution 666 (1990), which we have just adopted, will provide a clearer framework to duly consider and speedily act upon problems pertaining to the provision of foodstuffs to nationals from third countries stranded in Iraq and Kuwait.

Resolution 666 (1990) also lays down a basis to guide our activities as we proceed in the future to enforce resolution 661 (1990). In particular, we feel that the procedures contained in the provisions of the resolution, detailed and specific as they are, will enable us to take prompt decisions and act expeditiously to take measures to respond to humanitarian circumstances affecting the welfare and well-being of innocent civilians caught in the midst of this tragic political quagmire.

It is evident from the manner in which we have tried to proceed in the past few days that the lack of precise standards against which we could take decisions has held us back from making much progress. Now that we have crossed the Rubicon by way of instituting guidelines, we could respond quickly and responsibly to requests by countries seeking special consideration, and effectively relieve human suffering.

We believe that this position is consistent with the successive resolutions that we have so far adopted concerning the issue under consideration. We also remain convinced that it will help expedite the response to humanitarian concerns, without forsaking the ultimate objective of the Council - namely, the effective and speedy implementation of its successive resolutions, starting with resolution 660 (1990).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the Representative of Ethiopia for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I should first like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I take this opportunity also of thanking Mr. Munteanu, who guided our work so well in August. Like my colleagues, I welcome the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom. I express warmest wishes for the complete success of Sir David Hannay's work here.

More than one month after the invasion of Kuwait by Iraq, and while the Government of Iraq continues to refuse to abide by the five resolutions already adopted by the Security Council since the outbreak of the crisis, the situation of nationals of third States in those two countries - whether held as hostages or subjected by the tens of thousands to extremely precarious conditions - is becoming increasingly alarming.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

Responsibility for this situation rests entirely with Iraq, which is deliberately flouting its obligations under resolution 664 (1990) and in general the international commitments it has entered into by subscribing to the Geneva Convention in particular. Once again we call upon the Iraqi Government to respect that resolution.

We have already had opportunity here to denounce the mass hostage-taking in which Iraq is engaged. Similarly, today we condemn the way in which the Iraqi Government is trying to bypass the embargo imposed on it by the international community through using the distress of a foreign population it is doing nothing to help. In fact, while the Iraqi leaders have been asserting that they have several months' worth of foodstuff reserves, hundreds of thousands of foreigners are, as the Council is aware, in a situation of critical shortage. Equally, they are without water.

It is clear that the real solution of this problem lies in the speediest possible evacuation of those concerned. In this connection, resolution 664 (1990) is unambiguous. It requires that Iraq not only authorize but facilitate the departure of foreign nationals from its territory and that of Kuwait.

France is paying keenest attention to the plight of those foreigners who had settled in Iraq and Kuwait and are today impoverished and unable to return to their countries. It is playing an important part in the international effort to bring aid to those who have sought refuge in neighboring countries, particularly Jordan, and to organize their repatriation.

Clearly, those concerned must be able to receive from abroad the food Iraq has denied them. Security Council resolution 661 (1990) moreover stipulates that foodstuffs can be sent to Iraq and Kuwait in humanitarian circumstances. Obviously

(Mr. Blanc, France)

such supplies must be delivered in strict compliance with resolution 661 (1990) - that is, that must not contravene the embargo and must truly respond to humanitarian considerations without risk of diversion.

The Security Council and the subsidiary body it has established for this purpose can act properly only when circumstances so require and if the framework of its action is clearly defined. That is the purpose of the draft resolution just voted on, of which we were a sponsor.

In this connection I think it useful to emphasize two points.

First, it is indispensable that the Committee on resolution 661 (1990) for decision-making purposes have available to it objective and impartial information on the situation regarding foodstuffs in Iraq and Kuwait, in particular with regard to children and other vulnerable persons.

Then it is essential that the foodstuffs that may be supplied in fact reach those for whom they are intended. Such a guarantee can be given to the international community only if their shipment and distribution are carried out under close supervision by international organizations.

If the Iraqi authorities continue to refuse the involvement of such organizations, they will be responsible for the tragic consequences that may arise. We would hope that movement will occur in this connection, and we hope that Prince Sadruddin Agha Khan, whom the Secretary-General has just entrusted with the task of co-ordinating United Nations humanitarian actions in the region, will be able speedily to discharge his mission.

In conclusion, France would again express its hope that Iraq will accept all the resolutions adopted by the Council and that thus there will be a rapid peaceful settlement of this conflict with the withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait and the restoration of that State's independence. It is because of our devotion to such a

(Mr. Blanc, France)

peaceful settlement that we consider it indispensable that the means stipulated for its achievement - that is, the embargo - not be weakened.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of France for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada) (interpretation from French): It is very late now, or very early, and my introductory comments will be brief but no less sincere for that.

First we should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council; our thanks go to Ambassador Monteanu for his great commitment during the month of August; and we extend a cordial, warm welcome to Sir David Hannay, who has joined the Council.

Once again, following lengthy and at times very difficult negotiations, the Security Council has adopted by an overwhelming majority a resolution dealing with one of the most tragic aspects of the situation in Iraq and Kuwait. That resolution supplements in a very basic way certain key provisions of resolution 661 (1990), particularly its paragraphs 3 (c) and 4. The Committee we set up, entrusted with monitoring the implementation of sanctions, can now carry out its mandate in the light of the context and machinery resolution 666 (1990) has just given it.

(spoke in English)

We have acted in the face of the desparate situation faced by hundreds of thousands of third-country nationals who remain in Iraq and Kuwait and for whose welfare, contrary to the repeated demands of this Council and conventions of international law to which it is a party, the Government of Iraq steadfastly refuses to bear any responsibility. The plight of these distressed people as brought home to all of us day after day has deeply touched the hearts of all Canadians.

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

The resolution we have adopted today establishes a framework by which this body and the Committee it created pursuant to the adoption of Security Council resolution 661 (1990) will determine the existence of humanitarian circumstances which require that foodstuffs be supplied to the civilian population in Iraq or Kuwait in order to alleviate human suffering.

In the view of the Government of Canada it is important, it is vital, that any foodstuffs sent to the territory of either Iraq or Kuwait be provided through appropriate humanitarian agencies and distributed by them or under their supervision. Only by proceeding in this way can we be sure that these foodstuffs will reach their intended beneficiaries, including the most disadvantaged individuals. In this connection the Government of Canada warmly welcomes the decision of the Secretary-General to appoint Prince Sadruddin Agha Khan as his Personal Representative for humanitarian assistance relating to the crisis, in particular the problems of third-country nationals.

We call upon the Government of Iraq to co-operate fully and without delay with the Secretary-General's Personal Representative and to facilitate the early and full implementation of the resolution this Council has just adopted. The human tragedy to which we are bearing witness, and which is affecting the nationals of many Member States of the United Nations, must not and cannot be allowed to continue.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Canada for his kind words addressed to me.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): May I begin, Mr. President, by congratulating you on your assumption of the Chair of this Council, and your predecessor for the distinction with which he occupied it. May I also thank you and other colleagues who have spoken so kindly about my arrival here and about the work of my predecessor. I hope I will be able to live up to those good wishes.

This is the sixth occasion on which the Council has met to vote on a draft resolution on the crisis in the Gulf. On each occasion its action has been triggered by actions taken by Iraq in defiance of international law and of its international obligations.

On the first occasion Iraq had just invaded and occupied the territory of Kuwait. The Council passed resolution 660 (1990) condemning the invasion and demanding an immediate and unconditional Iraqi withdrawal.

On the second occasion, in the face of Iraqi non-compliance, the Council passed resolution 661 (1990) introducing sanctions as a peaceful means of bringing the invasion to an end. The Iraqi response was to compound its offense by the annexation of Kuwait. The Council passed a third resolution, resolution 662 (1990), deciding that the purported annexation was null and void.

Iraq then began to manipulate foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait by refusing to let them leave and placing some of them in strategic locations. That cynical behaviour, holding foreigners hostage in disregard of international law, was the object of a fourth resolution, resolution 664 (1990).

Most recently, the Council took action to counter Iraq's efforts to break the sanctions which it had imposed, and it passed a fifth resolution, resolution 665 (1990), which permits the use of minimum force to halt maritime shipping so as to ensure the strict implementation of sanctions.

(Sir David Hannay,
United Kingdom)

Now we are faced with yet a further breach by Iraq of international law and of its international obligations. The Iraqi Government is refusing to supply food to the poorest and most vulnerable of the third-country nationals in Kuwait, the workers from a number of Asian countries. The Government of Iraq is boasting that it still has considerable supplies of basic foodstuffs: these third-country nationals are simply being singled out for discriminatory treatment. And these are people who have played an important part in the economy of Kuwait. Now they are being cynically and as pawns by the Iraqi Government, and that is contrary to Iraq's obligations under the fourth Geneva Convention.

We should, of course, be in no doubt about Iraqi objectives. By provoking a human tragedy - to be blunt, by starving foreign nationals and in particular Asian workers on its own territory and in Kuwait - it is seeking to open a breach in the sanctions which this Council has imposed upon it. The resolution we have just adopted is designed to avoid such an outcome while at the same time meeting the real humanitarian needs of these innocent victims, as was clearly intended when the sanctions were imposed.

The Council is laying down guidelines to enable food to be supplied when it can be objectively established that a humanitarian need exists. These guidelines will permit food to be brought without delay to the Indian and other nationals from Asian countries who are now suffering. The Secretary-General has already drawn attention to their plight, and there is no need for a further report on their conditions.

The Indian ship loaded with supplies for the Asian nationals in Kuwait and in Iraq can sail immediately. But when it reaches its destination its cargo of food must be distributed under the supervision of the international humanitarian agencies to ensure it reaches those for whom it is intended. That point highlights

(Sir David Hannay,
United Kingdom)

a real difficulty. A régime which as an occupying Power has looted medical supplies and equipment from Kuwait is likely to have little compunction about diverting food supplies from those in real need towards its own military. Hence the provisions in the resolution, which were quite essential, that the supervision of the supply of food should be in the hands of the United Nations and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) or other appropriate humanitarian agencies. Iraq has so far refused to allow those agencies to play any role in the current conflict and has even refused to allow the President of the ICRC to go to Kuwait. I would only remark that in far worse situations in the past the international humanitarian organizations have been allowed to fulfil their mission and to provide relief.

We have heard a lot about the plight of these unfortunate nationals of Asian countries which has resulted from Iraq ignoring its own obligations towards them. I should just remark that in addition to all the words some of us, including my Government, have in fact committed ourselves with deeds to help those nationals. The United Kingdom has provided £2.75 million in bilateral aid for refugees from Iraq and Kuwait who have managed to reach Jordan, Turkey and Saudi Arabia. This has included £500,000 to the International Committee of the Red Cross and the Jordanian Red Crescent to meet the initial influx and £2 million to the programme of the International Organization for Migration to repatriate nationals of Bangladesh, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and the Philippines from the three countries I mentioned. In addition, the European Community has allocated £14.3 million for refugee repatriation and the provision of foodstuffs and medicines; Britain's share of that will be £2.8 million.

(Sir David Hannay,
United Kingdom)

This resolution has the full support of the British Government. Its passage will give the Council a framework within which food can be provided to those in real need, whether now or in the future, and at the same time it is designed to prevent Iraq from using the issue of humanitarian food supply, as it has clearly tried to do, to breach the sanctions adopted by this Council.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. REDZUAN (Malaysia): First, I should like to join previous speakers in congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September.

I should also like to convey my delegation's appreciation to the Permanent Representative of Romania for his fine and able guidance of the Council during the difficult month of August.

This occasion also provides an opportunity for my delegation to welcome Sir David Hannay, the new Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, to the Council.

We have taken too long a time to take a position on the matter before us. Our protracted discussions in the sanctions Committee almost converted that Committee into a venue for political arguments that were best aired in the Council itself. Obviously, we must do better in the future. There are at least a dozen petitions before the Committee. Each of those cases demands urgent and necessary action. The Jordanian case, for example, despite being recognized by the Committee as an exceptional case in which all efforts should be exerted to assist the country, has yet to come before the Council. We sincerely hope it will be taken up very soon.

(Mr. Redzuan, Malaysia)

Malaysia also hopes some lessons have been learnt. Clearly, the enormity of sanctions and how widely and deeply sanctions cut into people and States are well understood now. Sanctions are only justified by the collective objectives of effecting withdrawal and of reinstating Kuwait. Given those objectives, sanctions must perforce be effective in order for them to be of short duration. Few exceptions can be made, apart from those clearly based on humanitarian considerations within a framework determined by the Security Council.

This presents hard choices. No one can draw satisfaction from the across-the-board dislocation of States resulting from sanctions or from the misery inflicted on people. That we have taken the decision today, even if belatedly, to provide a framework for exceptions reflects the Council's realization that it must offer relief and life-sustaining action to those that require them.

The Council understands the need to contain human suffering as far as possible. Future actions of the Council will now proceed expeditiously, I hope, within the framework envisaged in this evening's resolution.

It is our understanding that the adoption of this resolution is to be accompanied immediately by a decision of the Committee established by resolution 661 (1990) to authorize India to send a shipment of foodstuffs to the affected nationals in Kuwait and Iraq. The Committee will also at the same time pronounce its concern and its readiness to alleviate the plight of thousands of innocent and hapless Indians, Filipinos, Sri Lankans and other foreign nationals languishing in extremely difficult conditions in Kuwait and Iraq by appealing for an emergency international evacuation and relief effort.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Malaysia for his kind words addressed to me.

Ms. RASI (Finland): On behalf of my delegation, allow me to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for the month of September.

I should also like to thank the Permanent Representative of Romania for the way in which he guided our work throughout the difficult month of August.

On behalf of my delegation, I should like, too, to welcome the new Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Sir David Hannay, to the Security Council.

The question now before us must be seen in the light of recent events. As we all too well recall, on 2 August Iraq invaded and subsequently declared the annexation of its neighbouring country, Kuwait.

Having received no positive reaction from Iraq to its first resolution on the matter calling for the immediate withdrawal of Iraqi troops from Kuwait, the Security Council adopted resolution 661 (1990) establishing economic sanctions against Iraq. This resolution was strengthened thereafter by resolution 665 (1990) under Chapter VII of the Charter.

With these two resolutions the Council established a mechanism intended to bring the crisis to a peaceful conclusion and to restore the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait.

The sanctions under resolution 661 (1990) must be scrupulously implemented. This, however, has to be done without causing any unnecessary human suffering in Iraq or Kuwait. The objectives of the sanctions are only those specified in the Council resolutions. The sanctions are by no means intended to bring Kuwaitis, Iraqis or third-country nationals under the threat of starvation. Interpreting resolution 661 (1990), the resolution just adopted - resolution 666 (1990) - establishes practical ways and means to prevent human suffering. It also enables

(Ms. Rasi, Finland)

the Council and its sanctions Committee to act rapidly whenever it is necessary to give emergency assistance to innumerable foreign nationals still in Kuwait and Iraq.

Iraq, for its part, is both legally and morally bound to extend its full co-operation to this important humanitarian issue.

For the aforementioned reasons, my country co-sponsored and voted in favour of the resolution just adopted. We were, however, not in a position to support the other draft resolution put to the vote because, in our view, the matter was settled in an appropriate way by resolution 666 (1990).

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Finland for her kind words addressed to me.

Mr. MUNTEANU (Romania): This being the first occasion for my delegation to speak in a formal meeting of the Security Council, I should like to address to you, Sir, the congratulations of my delegation on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. We are confident that under your able guidance, and with your diplomatic skill and experience, the Council will perform its important functions with full success.

I should also like to join other representatives in welcoming, on behalf of the Romanian delegation, Sir David Hannay, the representative of the United Kingdom. We wish him every success in his mission and would like to assure him of the full co-operation of the delegation of Romania.

The Romanian delegation shares the view that the question of the supply of foodstuffs in humanitarian circumstances to Iraq and Kuwait, in accordance with paragraph 3 (c) of resolution 661 (1990) is very topical. The resolution, as contained in document S/21747, is meant to offer solutions of a general nature to that requirement.

(Mr. Munteanu, Romania)

It seems to my delegation that the resolution just adopted covers adequately the main humanitarian requirements which in fact prompted such an action. This resolution should be considered as a set of practical guidelines for the implementation of paragraph 3 (c) of resolution 661 (1990). It will permit the granting of requests for international relief efforts to assist thousands of foreign nationals stranded in Kuwait and Iraq.

We hope that the adoption of resolution 666 (1990) will create favourable conditions for consultations requested by some Member States under Article 50 of the Charter. These consultations should lead to the identification of generally acceptable solutions for those countries which are seriously affected by the application of sanctions against Iraq. This should be done in the spirit of international solidarity which was the basis of the adoption of all resolutions concerning the situation between Iraq and Kuwait.

At the same time, my delegation would like to reiterate its position, as officially presented to the Council in its memorandum of 27 August 1990. In spite of the difficulties with which my country is confronted as a result of the implementation of sanctions against Iraq, Romania will strictly observe and fully apply the provisions of resolution 661 (1990).

Finally, my delegation would like to thank all those representatives who expressed kind words on Romania's presidency of the Security Council during the month of August.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Romania for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. AMET (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): Please allow me first, Sir, to congratulate you on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of September. I am convinced that your qualities as

(Mr. Anet, Côte d'Ivoire)

a professional diplomat and your great experience will guarantee the success of our work.

I should like to take this same opportunity to express the thanks of my delegation and my own personal thanks to Ambassador Munteanu of Romania, your predecessor, who displayed a great deal of talent and skill during our negotiations last month, which was particularly rich in events.

(Mr. Anet, Côte d'Ivoire)

We felt that it was difficult to succeed such an experienced and courteous diplomat as Ambassador Tickell, but he must have told you, Sir, that the United Nations has experienced its blackest moments since 2 August last. But is it not said that the blacker the night, the better one sees the stars? Your star has risen, Mr. Ambassador, and will guide the Security Council in the right direction, I am sure, and allow it to leave the dark path on which it now finds itself with the not insignificant possibility of attaining the irreparable at any moment.

The decision just taken by the Security Council is of capital importance in humanitarian terms. It shows the international community that by adopting resolution 661 (1990) concerning sanctions, the Security Council did not intend to use those sanctions as a food weapon to starve innocent populations. My delegation knows who is responsible for starving the Western hostages, the workers of countries that are all members of the non-aligned movement reduced to the state of human debris in the desert as well as the noble people of Kuwait. We know who is responsible - it is Iraq.

With the adoption of resolution 666 (1990), it will be possible to send foodstuffs to the civilian populations in Iraq and Kuwait and to lend particular attention to those who are vulnerable. But Iraq must allow that to happen. My delegation believes that the flexibility of the Security Council arising from humanitarian circumstances must go hand-in-hand with severity and vigilance if we are to achieve the goal set in resolution 660 (1990), which is unequivocal and calls for the unconditional withdrawal of Iraq from Kuwait.

My delegation is therefore pleased by the adoption of resolution 666 (1990), which defines the general context of all humanitarian action in favour of the civilian populations in Iraq and Kuwait. It will allow the Committee to undertake appropriate measures to relieve the suffering of the Indian, Sri Lankan and Philippine nationals and other foreign nationals stranded in Iraq and occupied Kuwait.

(Mr. Anet, Côte d'Ivoire)

It is to be desired that they be repatriated as soon as possible so as to avoid this tragic situation becoming an eternal one, as can be seen, regretfully, in other regions of our continent.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Côte d'Ivoire for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): My delegation would like to join in the congratulations that you, Sir, have received from earlier speakers. Similarly, we would like to express our thanks to Ambassador Munteanu, as other speakers have done.

We have spent almost a month and a half in almost uninterrupted meetings, and the entire world is filled with alarm as a result of the violation of international law by Mr. Saddam Hussein. When reference is made to the problem of food aid, we sometimes forget why we are discussing it, as if it were the result of a drought or an earthquake rather than of the decisions of one person.

My delegation has expressed itself clearly in that regard and has with full awareness voted in favour of the six resolutions adopted by the Council, particularly resolution 660 (1990), in which the Government of Iraq was condemned for its actions, and resolution 661 (1990), by means of which the embargo was imposed on Iraqi imports and exports as a peaceful means of avoiding armed action. At that time, we said that the Security Council could not allow a precedent to be established in which someone with enough power was able to impose his wishes on other States.

We voted in favour of resolution 666 (1990), which complements resolution 661 (1990) and fills some of its gaps. We would have wished resolution 666 (1990) to have considered a more efficient and feasible system than that which has been included in it. We are not very optimistic about the speedy and expeditious way in which it will function.

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

However, we have no illusions that the Government of Iraq is going to allow the resolution to function as many believe it will. For the Government of Iraq, it is no mystery that the Security Council, which has just adopted resolution 666 (1990), was the same body that imposed the sanctions.

We hope that in the near future measures will be adopted that will make the functioning of the Committee more efficient - perhaps because it has just begun its work, the Committee has to date demonstrated a high degree of inefficiency - and also fill some of the legal vacuums, such as the implementation or the handling and administering of the requests that have reached the Council under Article 50.

Iraq is using the hunger of the foreigners in its territory as another criminal and inhuman weapon. In this resolution, we would have wanted the Council more emphatically and clearly to deal with the status of foreigners who are subject to such attitudes on the part of the Iraqi Government.

Of course, the Iraqi inhabitants are the responsibility of Mr. Hussein and he he is responsible to them for his actions. It is sad that human beings must suffer from the consequences of the mad actions of their leaders, but it is preferrable to suffer from hunger rather than to be eliminated in a war. We do not forget that the wars of recent decades have left so many civilian dead.

Colombia prefers sanctions, however painful and costly, over war.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Colombia for his kinds words addressed to me.

I should now like to make a statement in my capacity as representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The aggression by Iraq against the State of Kuwait and the subsequent annexation of that State were described by the Security Council as a breach of international peace and security. Five Security Council resolutions, each logically flowing from the context of the evolving situation, have been adopted in answer to Iraq's actions. The international consensus with regard to the Iraqi aggression has been unequivocal: Iraq must withdraw immediately and unconditionally from Kuwait, restore the legitimate government of Kuwait and release all hostages held in Iraq and Kuwait. The Soviet Union actively participated in the drafting of those resolutions and voted in favour of all of them.

We were unable to act in any other way becaune the principles and norms of international law cannot be cast aside. The very nature of Iraq's conduct - and it had sufficient time to comply properly with the resolutions of the Security Council and redress its actions - has given us no other choice. As we know, at the very beginning of the crisis the Soviet Union laid the main emphasis on collective efforts based on the full use of the machinery and potential of the United Nations. It gave unequivocal preference to a solution of the crisis by diplomatic means. That was the position we took in considering resolution 661 (1990), which was adopted by an overwhelming majority of the Council. We considered that resolution to be a necessary and severe lever for collectively influencing Iraq in view of its continuing occupation of the State of Kuwait and its flouting of norms of international law.

(The President)

The Soviet delegation believed that the implementation of the Security Council's resolution would help to avoid further dangerous complications in the situation and make it possible to return to the status that existed prior to 2 August.

The Soviet delegation was of course fully aware that the implementation of the sanctions in their entirety, as provided by resolution 661 (1990), would create serious economic, social and humanitarian problems for many States. Those problems would be felt first and foremost by those countries directly involved in the crisis, but certainly not confined to them. I should like to note that the régime set up by the Security Council in respect to Iraq has created many problems of an economic nature for my own country as well.

At the same time, we cannot in all our discussions lose sight of the basic fact that the primordial reason for all those problems is the continuing occupation and annexation of the State of Kuwait by Iraq and that they were not created by the sanctions adopted as a result of those actions. If we are to lose sight of that primary reason or gloss over it, we will run the risk of departing from the course set for us in our work here. I am referring to the course laid down in the Charter of the United Nations. The adoption of sanctions was a natural and necessary reaction to an act of aggression and is in full accordance with the provisions of the Charter, with which all States that have joined the Organization have solemnly committed themselves to comply.

Of course, the Security Council does not feel that economic sanctions are aimed at causing hunger and disease among the populations of Iraq and Kuwait. As is well known, that aspect was the subject of special consideration at the recent Helsinki meeting between the President of the Soviet Union, Mr. Gorbachev, and the President of the United States, Mr. Bush. In the joint communiqué issued following that meeting, emphasis was laid on the fact that

(The President)

"the Soviet Union and the United States recognize that Security Council resolution 661 (1990) permits the export of foodstuffs to Iraq and Kuwait for humanitarian considerations."

In that connection the joint communiqué singled out the role of the sanctions Committee as well as the existing international agencies called upon to supervise the supply of foodstuffs as intended.

In light of this entire set of considerations, we have approached the basic idea of the resolution as a clear recognition of the internationally recognized need for procedures to allow for the humanitarian provision of foodstuffs and medical supplies to Iraq and Kuwait. We believe that the resolution will circumvent artificial impediments and make it possible effectively to solve specific problems, for example in connection with the vessel dispatched by India to assist its nationals in Kuwait. It is also important that the resolution places special emphasis on the situation of children and mothers, the sick and the elderly and all who are experiencing special suffering as a result of the aggression.

The Soviet delegation therefore, by actively participating in the preparation of the resolution, which was submitted by a number of countries, lent its support to resolution 666 (1990).

As for the other draft resolution submitted today, it is our view that it clearly departed from the spirit and purposes and specific provisions adopted by a majority of Council members in resolution 661 (1990). The Soviet delegation was therefore unable to support it.

I now resume my function as President of the Security Council.

I call upon the representative of Kuwait, who has asked to make a statement.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait)(interpretation from Arabic): It is a source of pleasure for my delegation to see you, Sir, a representative of the great and fraternal country of the Soviet Union, presiding over the Council's work for this month. Your reputation and vast experience and wisdom are well known. We offer you our congratulations and wish you well and are sure that you will conduct the Council's work with your characteristic wisdom.

I should also like to take this opportunity to express to our friend Ambassador Munteanu, Permanent Representative of Romania, our congratulations on the excellent manner in which he conducted the work of the Council last month, during which the Security Council played its effective role in defending international peace and security and in translating the principles of the Charter into implementable resolutions.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

I should also like to welcome among us the new Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom, Sir David Hannay. I wish him every success as he carries out his task of serving his country here. I am sure that our two delegations will fully co-operate with each other in the interests of the just causes of the world.

The brutal Iraqi aggression against Kuwait has not confined itself to violating the independence and territorial integrity of Kuwait: Iraq has engaged in the worst kinds of activities against the Moslem country of Kuwait. It has plundered that country's resources and wealth, in a manner unparalleled in history. Iraq is in violation of all the norms of conduct. It can be said safely and very humbly that the actions of the Iraqi forces amount to unscrupulous armed robbery of the movable property in Kuwait. Even hospital equipment has been stolen. Patients have been left to die on the spot as a result of the theft not only of medicines but also of sophisticated medical equipment. The Iraqi soldiers are so brutal and so arrogant that even premature babies have been left to die because the medical equipment they need has been stolen and taken to Iraq.

Reports have been made to the Security Council about these actions, of unparalleled inhumanity. We call upon the Council to shoulder its moral responsibility by playing a role of deterrence vis-à-vis Iraq, in order to compel it to stop this inhuman action immediately.

The Iraqi aggressor has not limited itself to defying the international will and showing contempt for the basic values and traditions of mankind, not to speak of the injunctions of Islam. No, it has extended its brutality to the daily subsistence of the Kuwaiti people, to their foodstuffs. The Iraqi forces have started to plunder huge amounts of food stored in Kuwait - food that used to supply the flourishing markets of that secure country. Whatever food is left is now being usurped by the Iraqi forces, which are supervising its distribution. They have

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

prevented the Kuwaitis, who are the legitimate and rightful owners of the land, from getting the necessary food. Iraqi soldiers have broken into Kuwaiti homes, violating their sanctity and stealing whatever food they could lay their hands on.

While we have great sympathy for the people of third countries who are in Kuwait - indeed our hearts go out to them - and while we sympathize with the positions of their Governments, we should like, at the same time, to direct the Council's attention to the fact that the entire Kuwaiti people has suffered tremendously under this brutal aggression, as a result of the practices engaged in by the occupation forces and the policy of the aggressive Iraqi leadership. All this is not in conformity with the basic rules of justice and the norms of human behaviour.

We understand the reasons behind the resolution just adopted. In this connection, we should like to stress the following points:

First, the plight of the Kuwaiti people should be kept in mind in any consideration of solutions to humanitarian questions and the effects of the brutality of the aggressor. This should not deflect our attention from the plight of the nationals of third countries. Nor should it bar us from considering the basic problem - that is, the problem of the Kuwaitis: their food, their safety, their rights, their land.

Secondly, we have no confidence at all in the occupying Power. That Power should not be given any role in determining the needs of the Kuwaitis or in regard to the distribution of food. The competent international organizations should carry out this humanitarian task. They should be entrusted with applying the Fourth Geneva Convention. The occupying Power has no regard for human values. Therefore, it should not be given any role in these processes. Those who do not have any human feelings cannot show humanity towards others.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Thirdly, in no circumstances should these humanitarian questions - important, indeed vital, as they are - deflect our attention from the crux of the question: the continued Iraqi occupation of Kuwait and Iraq's refusal to comply with international law by implementing the Security Council resolutions. We agree with the representative of Yemen that what is most valuable is human life itself. What has the Iraqi army been doing to Kuwaiti human beings ever since the aggression against Kuwait? Has it not killed Kuwaitis? Has it not violated the sanctity of Kuwaiti homes? Has it not been ruthless towards the population, including the sick, the elderly and the women? Yes, the Iraqis have done that. Should not those who suffer because others are going hungry also raise their voices against the suffering of an entire people? They should shoulder their full responsibility here in the Security Council in order to stop the aggression against and the occupation of that people.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

The representative of Cuba went into detail with regard to the economic difficulties of some countries, such as fraternal Jordan, saying a month has elapsed since we received Jordan's report on its difficult economic circumstances. The repesentative of Cuba spoke of the Council's moral reponsibilities.

Have some representatives forgotten that this is the forty-fourth day since the beginning of Iraq's aggression against Kuwait and its brutal acts against its people? Is that not the crux of the matter? Those problems should be ended now.

What some members forget is that not since the Second World War has any other country had its identity challenged in an act of aggression by another country. The detailed comparisons that have been made here ignore that this act has no parallel since the Second World War. It was an attempt to remove the identity of a secure country through a brutal, naked aggression against a Member State of the United Nations.

The measures the Council has taken are appropriate to the situation.

The Security Council, which has taken an honourable, outstanding position since the aggression began, is now called upon to turn up the heat on Iraq to bring it to comply with its resolutions and fully and unconditionally withdraw from Kuwait so that its legitimate Government may be restored and Kuwait may once again play its pioneering role in the service of peace and security in the region.

The people of Kuwait and its lawful leadership place on record their appreciation to the States that have supported us in this difficult time for their courageous stand.

We do understand the concerns of those States that have nationals living in Kuwait. Kuwait calls upon all countries to put a speedy end to the occupation, for that is the only way to normalize the situation. They have demonstrated passionate concern with regard to the humanitarian aspects of this question, and they should

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

show the same passionate concern with regard to full Iraqi withdrawal: that is the only way to end the aggression and its consequences.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I thank the representative of Kuwait for his kind words addressed to me.

We have heard the last speaker for this meeting. The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Security Council will remain actively seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 1.15 a.m.

UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2940
16 September 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND FORTIETH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Sunday, 16 September 1990, at 2.15 a.m.

President:	Mr. VORONTSOV	(Union of Soviet Socialist Republics)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. JIN Yongjian
	Colombia	Mr. PENALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ANET
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. TADESSE
	Finland	Ms. RASI
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. RAZALI
	Romania	Mr. FLOREAN
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir David HANNAY
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Zaire	Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-61050/A 1207V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 2.15 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAQ AND KUWAIT

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF FRANCE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21755)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF ITALY TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21756)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CANADA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21757)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF DENMARK TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21758)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21759)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF BELGIUM TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21760)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF FINLAND TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21761)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE CHARGE D'AFFAIRES A.I. OF THE PERMANENT MISSION OF AUSTRIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21762)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF HUNGARY TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21763)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF SPAIN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21764)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE NETHERLANDS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21765)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF GREECE TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21766)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF IRELAND TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21767)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF SWEDEN TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21768)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF NORWAY TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21769)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF PORTUGAL TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21770)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF AUSTRALIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21771)

LETTER DATED 15 SEPTEMBER 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF LUXEMBOURG TO THE UNITED NATIONS (S/21773)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I should like to inform the Security Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Iraq, Italy and Kuwait in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kadrat (Iraq) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait) took a place at the Council table; Mr. Traxler (Italy) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The Council is meeting in response to the requests contained in letters dated 15 September 1990 addressed to the President of the Security Council from the Permanent Representative of France to the United Nations, document S/21755; the Permanent Representative of Italy to the United Nations, document S/21756; the

(The President)

Permanent Representative of Canada to the United Nations, document S/21757; the Permanent Representative of Denmark to the United Nations, document S/21758; the Permanent Representative of the Federal Republic of Germany, document S/21759; the Permanent Representative of Belgium to the United Nations, document S/21760; the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Finland to the United Nations, document S/21761; the Chargé d'affaires ad interim of the Permanent Mission of Austria to the United Nations, document S/21762; the Permanent Representative of Hungary to the United Nations, document S/21763; the Permanent Representative of Spain to the United Nations, document S/21764; the Permanent Representative of the Netherlands to the United Nations, document S/21765; the Permanent Representative of Greece to the United Nations, document S/21766; the Permanent Representative of Ireland to the United Nations, document S/21767; the Permanent Representative of Sweden to the United Nations, document S/21768; the Permanent Representative of Norway to the United Nations, document S/21769; the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations, document S/21770; the Permanent Representative of Australia to the United Nations, document S/21771; and the Permanent Representative of Luxembourg to the United Nations, document S/21773.

(The President)

Members of the Council also have before them document S/21774, which contains the text of a draft resolution submitted by Canada. Cote d'Ivoir, Finland, France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Zaire.

It is my understanding that the Security Council is ready to proceed to the vote on the draft resolution before it. Unless I hear any objection, I shall put the draft resolution to the vote now. Since we have an understanding that members who so wish may make their statements before the vote, I shall now call upon those members that wish to do so.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): France called for the immediate convening of the Council in order without delay to consider events of special gravity that have just occurred in Kuwait. Indeed, in recent days Iraq has violated international law and the Vienna Conventions on diplomatic relations and consular relations by forcibly entering the diplomatic premises of several countries, some of them members of the Council, and removing from them diplomatic personnel and persons not enjoying diplomatic status.

In the residence of the French Ambassador, the Iraqi army apprehended four French nationals present there, namely the Military Attaché and three persons not enjoying diplomatic status. If our Military Attaché has since been released, the three other French nationals have joined the numerous foreigners held hostage in Iraq and Kuwait.

The French Government has at the national level already taken a number of steps. We believe that this is a new intolerable act of aggression on the part of Iraq, which, through certain members of the international community, is aimed at the international community as a whole. This compounds the initial aggression by Iraq against Kuwait and the second aggression constituted by the taking hostage of several thousand people of various nationalities. The purpose of these latest

(Mr. Blanc, France)

actions is clear. By attacking diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait, Iraq is seeking the disappearance of that State.

As it did after the two previous instances of aggression, our Council must act vigorously and swiftly, by firmly condemning the inadmissible violations that have just been committed and by demanding that Iraq immediately release not only the persons just kidnapped but all foreign nationals that have been taken hostage.

We must ensure the success of the strategy chosen by the international community, namely the embargo. It is therefore necessary to recall that the embargo must be strictly respected and that its implementation to that end must be monitored with vigilance.

Finally we must send Iraq a clear warning that in view of its persistent refusal to comply with Security Council resolutions the international community is determined to adopt other measures.

France, which since the beginning of the crisis has acted within the framework of the United Nations, hopes that Iraq will finally comply with the will expressed by the international community through our Council's resolutions. To that end it is essential that the international community continue to stand firm against all new activities contrary to international law and to the resolutions of the Council perpetrated by Iraq. Accordingly we call upon the members of the Council to support the draft resolution before them.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada): Canada has joined with a number of other countries in requesting this immediate meeting of the Security Council. Our decision to do so was necessitated by the continuing flagrant violations of international law on the part of the Government of Iraq. The unlawful entry into the residence of the Canadian Ambassador in Kuwait yesterday and the detention of a Canadian diplomat, as well as a number of his diplomatic colleagues, is totally and unequivocally

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

unacceptable and yet further evidence of Iraq's continuing disdain for the resolutions of this Council, in particular its resolution 664 (1990).

We are pleased that once again the international community as here represented in the Security Council, and with the active support of many Member States of the United Nations which appealed for urgent action, will speak with a decisive and determined voice. We have no doubt that that will be so. The draft resolution we will adopt shortly is clear and cannot be subjected to nuance of interpretation. In no uncertain terms we will condemn the aggressive acts perpetrated by Iraq against diplomatic premises and personnel in Kuwait, as well as the abduction of foreign nationals who were present on those premises. We will demand their immediate release as well as the release of all other detained nationals.

(spoke in French)

For the seventh time since 2 August 1990 our Council is meeting urgently to make it possible for the international community to express its indignation and condemnation of Iraq. Yet again we demand that Iraq comply immediately and unreservedly with its international obligations. We also demand that it protect and ensure the well-being of the diplomatic and consular personnel and premises in Kuwait, as it is its obligation to do under the international conventions to which it is a party.

(continued in English)

By this evening adopting the seventh draft resolution on the situation between Iraq and Kuwait since Iraq brutally invaded Kuwait at the beginning of August, this Council will lay out, once again, the standards of conduct to which Iraq must adhere if it wishes to resume its place as a full member of the international community. Canada sincerely hopes that Iraq will now do what it is called upon to do - indeed what it must do. Its failure to respond appropriately and without

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

delay will only lead to further action on the part of this Council, which remains committed to living up to its responsibilities under the Charter of the United Nations.

Sir David HANNAY (United Kingdom): In resolution 662 (1990) the Council declared the purported annexation of Kuwait null and void. Iraq's subsequent campaign to force the closure of diplomatic missions in Kuwait is therefore both a breach of the Vienna Convention and a defiance of the resolutions of the Council.

The breaching of the inviolability of the French embassy and of its occupants is only the latest and most serious example of Iraq's total disregard for its international obligations. Diplomatic immunity is probably the oldest part of international customary law. It does not exist for the personal comfort of diplomats but to enable them to carry out their main tasks of protecting their nationals and helping to resolve international disputes by peaceful means. The whole international community has benefited over centuries by the adherence to this concept.

Iraq, by its treatment of foreign nationals, has shown that it has no interest in fulfilling its international obligations for their well-being and by its invasion of Kuwait has shown that it has no interest in the peaceful resolution of disputes. It is therefore not surprising, but it is utterly deplorable, that for weeks now Iraq has been trying to force foreign diplomats out of Kuwait by cutting off their water, their electricity and their telephones, and by surrounding their embassies with troops. Some diplomats have been forced to leave, but many have stayed to look after the interests of their nationals. My Government pays a tribute to the courage and determination of those in its own diplomatic service who have stayed on at their posts in these gruelling conditions, and it pays a tribute similarly to those of other nations who have done likewise.

Iraq has now taken a further step in breach of its international obligations. Iraqi troops have forced their way into a number of diplomatic premises in Kuwait City and abducted diplomats and other foreign citizens who were staying there. Some of have been released but others have not.

(Sir David Hannay, United Kingdom)

The draft resolution before the Council condemns this latest Iraqi action. Condemnation is necessary but it is only a first step. We are therefore determined to ensure that the consultations to which we are committed by paragraph 6 of the draft resolution before the Council, calling for further measures to deal with Iraq's continuing violation of its international obligations and the decisions of the Security Council, to be brought to a speedy conclusion and lead an intensification of the pressure to bring Iraq into conformity with the resolutions of the Council.

Mr. RAZALI (Malaysia): Malaysia will support the adoption of the draft resolution in the overall interest of demonstrating further the common purpose of the Security Council to have a collective response to all actions stemming from that single act of aggression committed on 2 August. The actions that violate the immunity and inviolability of certain diplomatic missions in Kuwait require an immediate and determined response. As these actions stem primarily from that original act of 2 August, these actions may be interpreted as aggressive acts.

The interpretation that these actions are taken not against diplomatic missions on the argument that their status has changed is clearly not acceptable. These missions that are determined to stay on in Kuwait, at some risk and sacrifice, make a strong international statement that the sovereignty of Kuwait remains inviolable, recognized and intact.

Malaysia interprets the significance of operative paragraph 6 as a collective determination to continue to take action through the Security Council of the United Nations and not unilaterally. We also see the purpose of paragraph 6 as one that underlines a strong resolve, but at this stage this resolve is clearly absent of any need to resort to more force.

Ms. RASI (Finland): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the five Nordic countries, Denmark, Iceland, Norway, Sweden and my own country, Finland.

During the Gulf crisis Iraq has already breached several long-established and uncontroversial rules of international law and State conduct. For several weeks now concern has mounted regarding the fate of foreign diplomats in Kuwait. Now Iraq has stepped up its action in complete disregard of its obligations and of customary international law and the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations, to which Iraq is a party.

The sequence of events started from Iraq's illegal declaration to annex Kuwait, followed by its demand to close foreign embassies and consular offices in Kuwait and its order to foreign diplomatic and consular officials to move to Baghdad. Thereafter, increasing pressure was mounted on the many embassies and consular offices, which continued to remain open. Supplies of running water were cut, electricity was cut, military forces were used to prevent the free movement of protected persons and to maintain a continuing threat of force.

The use of force against protected persons is Iraq's most recent action. The violation of diplomatic and consular immunities perpetrated by Iraq's armed forces is not only in blatant conflict with Iraq's international obligations, but its scope and deliberateness are also unprecedented in recent history. The protection of diplomats and consular personnel, as well as the inviolability of their premises, is one of the oldest and clearest rules of international law. These rules also enjoy primary importance in Islamic law and practice. By breaking them, Iraq has chosen to remain oblivious to world opinion, as well as the traditions of the culture which it claims to represent.

(Ms. Rasi, Finland)

The Nordic countries condemn Iraq's recent action as illegal and unjustifiable. The Nordic countries are, however, fully conscious that the crisis continues to have many other aspects. The annexation of Kuwait has not been brought to an end. The fate of thousands of foreigners remains imperilled. The threat of war is a reality. Iraq's most recent actions are only a part of the tragedy as a whole, but their importance lies in showing how far Iraq is prepared to go to breach the most fundamental rules of international conduct.

Let me recall that the embargo was chosen by the Security Council as a political means to deal with the crisis in order to achieve a peaceful solution to the dangerous situation. Full compliance with resolution 661 (1990) is therefore essential to attain this goal.

Mr. LUKABU KHABOUJI N'ZAJI (Zaire) (interpretation from French): As recently as last Thursday my delegation indicated to the Council that in the Gulf crisis Iraq had shown absolute contempt for the Security Council and its decisions and, thus, for the international community as a whole.

By violating the diplomatic missions and attacking persons enjoying diplomatic immunity, Iraq is disregarding the commitments it freely undertook when it ratified the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations of 15 October 1963 and 15 January 1970. Iraq has thus placed itself outside the system of law and has moved into that of force, with all that that entails.

With regard to the two aforementioned Conventions, Zaire believes that these legal instruments constitute a guarantee of order and respect in relations between States. My country reaffirms here its belief in respect for principles of law, and it cannot, under any circumstances, accept their violation. For that reason, my country, Zaire, is a sponsor of the draft resolution to be voted upon, and we will vote in favour of it. That is Zaire's collective response to all measures of intimidation and provocation by Iraq towards the international community.

Mr. JIN Yongjian (China) (interpretation from Chinese): The Chinese delegation was shocked at the unlawful intrusion into the premises of some countries' embassies in Kuwait and that their diplomats and other personnel were detained and grossly treated. This action of Iraq is a serious violation of international law, the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations and the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, as well as of resolutions 662 (1990) and 664 (1990) of the Security Council. This has further complicated and exacerbated the already seriously Gulf situation. We strongly call upon the Iraqi Government immediately to stop and to avoid taking any more actions of this kind, to implement in real earnest its international obligations and to ensure the safety of

(Mr. Jin Yongjian, China)

diplomatic missions and their personnel in Kuwait so that the diplomatic missions can perform their normal functions. It is on the basis of that position that we will vote in favour of the draft resolution.

In recent days the foreign nationals in Iraq and Kuwait, including Asian nationals in their hundreds of thousands, have been stranded. Their plight has caused great concern in the international community. The Security Council adopted resolution 666 (1990) on the question of supplies of foodstuffs to be sent to Iraq and Kuwait in humanitarian circumstances, and the Committee established under resolution 661 (1990) has issued a statement in that regard. We are of the view that those foreign nationals are innocent and should not be hurt by the sanctions. In accordance with international law Iraq has the responsibility to ensure their rights and interests. China supports the proper measures taken by the countries concerned in protecting their nationals. We hope that the Iraqi Government will implement the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, co-operate fully with countries and international organizations concerned and alleviate the sufferings of those foreign nationals so as to facilitate an appropriate solution of this problem.

The Security Council has already adopted a number of resolutions. A certain period of time is needed so that the resolutions may yield fruitful results in the endeavour to seek a political settlement of the present Gulf crisis. China has consistently held that the Gulf crisis should be given a political solution through peaceful means. We believe that this is an effective way for restoring peace in the Gulf at an early date. The draft resolution contains a formulation "to take further concrete measures", whose implications we find too wide and which may not be conducive to the efforts of all parties in seeking a political settlement. Therefore, we express our reservation in this regard.

Mr. ANET (Côte d'Ivoire) (interpretation from French): In adopting the draft resolution before it the Council will be adopting its seventh resolution condemning Iraq. This proves that the international community does not intend to stop its efforts to bring Iraq to dialogue.

Sacha Guitry said that

"When a couple seems to be somehow getting along it means that everything is all right."

So long as the Council continues to condemn Iraq and appeal for its understanding and so long as it continues to urge that the Secretary-General play a role, it means that we are still at peace - peace is the very raison d'être of the United Nations.

Since 2 August, Iraq has constantly violated international law, and in this specific instance in violating the Vienna Convention it ratified, it is once again demostrating its contempt for its international obligations.

For our part, it is the duty of the Security Council to act firmly and to condemn Iraq once again. In this connection it is worth recalling that by adopting resolution 662 (1990) the Council unanimously rejected Iraq's annexation of Kuwait. My country is of the view that all the problems raised by that annexation should be resolved within the framework of the United Nations and, in particular, the Security Council. Iraq must ensure the protection of all diplomatic and consular personnel in Iraq as well as in occupied Kuwait.

For those reasons my delegation is a sponsor of the draft resolution, which once again reaffirms the obligations by which Iraq is bound in keeping with the provisions of international law governing relations among States. The draft resolution affords Iraq a further opportunity to reverse its annexation of Kuwait. Certain Arab Heads of State have advised this course. My delegation fears that

(Mr. Anet, Côte d'Ivoire)

Iraq's persistent refusal to comply with Security Council resolutions represents a serious escalation which can only lead to a breach of peace.

Mr. PICKERING (United States of America): Once again, Iraq has violated a fundamental rule of international law. Not satisfied with violations such as depriving diplomatic missions in Kuwait of food, water and other services, Iraqi Special Forces troops have now added to their crimes, breaking and entering diplomatic premises, kidnapping the French military attaché and three French citizens, ransacking the house and treating brutally two female Philippino-citizen workers.

The felonies of the Iraqi authorities are not random events, as their violation of Belgian, Canadian and Dutch diplomatic premises confirms, and including as well the detention of an American consular officer accredited in Baghdad. These diplomats are there, in part at least, to protect the now-incarcerated, harassed and starved citizens of their own States. By singling out diplomatic missions for attack, Iraq has in a special way confirmed its preference for the instruments of force over the paths of diplomacy and negotiation. This choice of Iraq threatens the ability of the Security Council and its members to resolve through diplomatic means the conflict launched by Iraq since its invasion of Kuwait.

(Mr. Pickering, United States)

Tonight this Council has had to respond quickly to this new violation. But this resolution does not discharge the members of the Council of their obligations to take concrete steps. At the earliest possible date, tomorrow if possible, we must take concrete measures under Chapter VII of the Charter to deal with Iraq's continuing violation of the Charter, the resolutions of the Council and international law. My delegation welcomes the decision of the Council to take those steps and the commitment of Council members to do so quickly. All States have an explicit duty, as stated in resolution 661 (1990) and reconfirmed in paragraph 5 of this draft resolution, to report any failure to comply with the resolutions the Council has adopted as a result of Iraq's violations.

As proven by Iraq's expulsion of Kuwaiti citizens from the State of Kuwait in flagrant violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention, Iraqi crimes of violence are continuing. Members of the Council have a special duty to keep the spotlight of world attention on Iraq's behaviour and to take concrete measures to restore international peace and security. The United States delegation will do its part.

Mr. FLOREAN (Romania): Romania supported the adoption of resolutions 660, 661, 662, 664, 665 and 666 (1990) on the item "The situation between Iraq and Kuwait" and called for their immediate and unconditional implementation. It is in the same spirit and in conformity with the same position that Romania expresses its full support for the draft resolution we are going to adopt this morning.

We fully share the preoccupations expressed here by other delegations concerning the negative consequences of the violation by Iraq of the diplomatic privileges and immunities of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait. The acts committed against some embassies in Kuwait are in flagrant violation of the basic principles and rules of diplomatic law and of international law in general.

(Mr. Florean, Romania)

As a country deeply affected by events in the Gulf region, Romania expressed immediately after the emergence of this problem its point of view on the acts perpetrated by Iraqi authorities against diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait. The Romanian Government made an appeal on that occasion for respect for the universally accepted principles of international law and in particular of diplomatic law. The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania stated at that time that he did not intend to close the Romanian Embassy in Kuwait. We have clearly made known our position concerning the illegal decision by Iraqi authorities to close the foreign embassies in Kuwait. While keeping our embassy in Kuwait functioning, we have brought attention to our strong position against the measures undertaken by the Iraqi authorities against diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait. Given the aggravated circumstances and conditions imposed by the Iraqi military occupation authorities in Kuwait, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Romania has decided for humanitarian reasons to repatriate the staff of the Romanian embassy in Kuwait. This decision does not in any way affect the continuity of diplomatic relations between Romania and Kuwait. The activities of the Romanian embassy in Kuwait will be resumed immediately when adequate conditions exist for the work and life of the diplomatic personnel.

We also have to stress Iraq's full responsibility for the consequences deriving from the measures undertaken against the diplomatic and consular missions. From a more general point of view, my delegation would like to recall that Romania stands for the withdrawal without delay of Iraqi military forces beyond the internationally recognized boundary between the two countries and for the restoration of the legitimate Government of Kuwait. At the same time we believe that all States should act in strict conformity with the universally accepted principles of international law. It is imperative that all States display

(Mr. Florean, Romania)

moderation and responsibility and undertake nothing that may further aggravate the situation. Any new escalation of force would make settlement of the situation, which is already particularly serious, even more difficult.

What continues to be necessary is to resort to political action and to keep dialogue always open.

Finally, my delegation would like to reiterate its position as officially presented to the Council in its memorandum of 27 August 1990. In spite of the difficulties with which my country is confronted as a result of the implementation of sanctions against Iraq, Romania will strictly observe and fully apply the provisions of resolution 661 (1990), as well as of the resolution we are going to adopt this morning.

Mr. PEÑALOSA (Colombia) (interpretation from Spanish): My Government wishes to express its deep concern over the new events that are being considered this morning by the Council. In every respect this is not a fortuitous event but one that is deliberate and is conducive to increased escalation in the Gulf region. Despite the fact that in resolution 664 (1990) the Security Council reaffirms that annexation of Kuwait by Iraq is null and void and demands that the Government of Iraq rescind its orders for the closure of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait and the withdrawal of the immunity of their personnel, and refrain from any such actions in the future, the Iraqi Government has not acted accordingly. On the contrary, it has aggravated the situation.

Colombia joins in the protest and condemnation by the international community, which include an unequivocal message to the Iraqi authorities that they desist from their acts of harrassment and comply unconditionally with the demands of the Security Council. My delegation believes that it is up to Iraq as the invading State to guarantee the security of each and every diplomatic or consular mission,

(Mr. Peñalosa, Colombia)

as well as their personnel, in conformity with international norms and custom safeguarding the exercise of the noble and historic profession of diplomacy. We would have preferred not to see included the reference contained in operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution, because the Charter clearly sets forth the obligation of all States Members of the Organization to accept and comply with decisions taken by the Security Council, as well as their duty to fulfil their obligations in good faith, convinced that in this way we are being consistent with the universally recognized principle that was in fact introduced into the Charter on Colombia's initiative. None the less, faced with the facts before us today and the continued and flagrant violations of human rights of the Kuwaiti population in open violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention, we believe that presentation of these standards in operative paragraph 5 reaffirms the international community's commitment to find a speedy solution of this crisis.

(Mr. Peñaloza, Colombia)

Moreover, we are convinced that the Security Council is fully empowered to adopt new measures in the context of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Hence, paragraph 6 of the draft resolution is somewhat redundant; but this places no obstacle in the path of my Government's support of the text proposed by the delegation of France and sponsored by a number of members of the Council, and we shall vote in favour of the draft resolution.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The crisis caused by Iraq's occupation and subsequent annexation of the State of Kuwait remains the focus of attention in the Security Council. Despite its stubborn persistence, that crisis must be resolved by political and diplomatic means. The international community insists that Iraq fulfil its obligations under the United Nations Charter, under the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, which as a Member of the Organization it must implement, and under other international legal documents of which Iraq is a signatory.

At the same time, reports from the region continue to fill us with grave concern and fear. The latest actions of the Iraqi authorities towards personnel of the Embassies of France and several other States in Kuwait show that Iraq continues to ignore the will of the international community and refuses to cease its illegal actions against diplomatic and consular premises in Kuwait. Those actions constitute a flagrant violation of the fundamental principles and norms governing relations among civilized States and of specific provisions of Security Council resolution 664 (1990) by which Iraq is obliged not to obstruct the activities of diplomatic and consular missions in Kuwait.

(The President)

All of us around this table are diplomats, and we understand that the dignity and interests of States require full respect for their diplomatic representatives. Any infringement on diplomatic missions and their personnel - even more, any deprivation of their immunities and their ability to carry out their duties and obligations - has been considered since the earliest days of civilization an encroachment on the honour and sovereign rights of the States those diplomats represent.

We therefore support such provisions of the draft resolution and share the legitimate indignation they express at the latest actions by Iraq. We shall vote in favour of the draft resolution.

We have the right to expect that the Government of Iraq will finally heed the demands of the Security Council, principal among them the immediate complete withdrawal of all Iraqi forces from the State of Kuwait so that the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of that State may be restored. Iraq must understand that with the adoption of the draft resolution before it the Security Council will be sending Iraq a strict warning that its failure to abide by the Charter will lead the Council to adopt further measures aimed at securing the unconditional implementation of its decisions and reflecting the will of the international community, which is declaring with determination that aggression cannot and will not bear fruit.

Like other countries, the Soviet Union hopes that common sense and responsibility will prevail in Iraq and that in that way the crisis will be resolved.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

I shall now put draft resolution S/21774 to the vote.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Yemen, Zaire

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): There were 15 votes in favour. The draft resolution has thus been adopted unanimously as resolution 667 (1990).

I shall now call on those members of the Council who wish to make statements following the voting.

Mr. ALARCON DE QUESADA (Cuba) (interpretation from Spanish): At the outset, my delegation wishes to express its appreciation to the delegation of France for the position it took in the negotiations that led to the resolution we have just adopted and for its willingness to seek compromise formulations that made it possible for all members of the Council to support the text.

I must, however, say that, unfortunately, the resolution we have just adopted contains some elements on which I must comment. Above all, the text reaffirms some resolutions with respect to which our position is not changed by the vote we have just cast; that vote should not be interpreted as reflecting a change in our position. In our view, resolution 665 (1990) violates the United Nations Charter; resolution 666 (1990), adopted only two days ago, contains approaches and criteria which in our judgement are marred by inhumanity.

My delegation would have preferred different wording in some paragraphs of the text we have just adopted, where reference is made to aggressive acts, which seem to us to be somewhat excessive since such expressions were not used even in resolution 660 (1990), which referred to the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait. We are also concerned about paragraph 6, since it might be inferred that some Powers could use its provisions to exacerbate the conflict and press on to military action.

(Mr. Alarcon de Quesada, Cuba)

We regret that no reference is made in this text to the need to continue the efforts to find a peaceful solution to the conflict. We regret also that no space was found to mention the responsibility and function in connection with diplomatic missions in Kuwait that can and should devolve upon the Secretary-General.

My delegation decided nevertheless to vote in favour of this resolution because we agree with the major elements of its operative part. We regard as absolutely unacceptable the actions in violation of the integrity of diplomatic premises and personnel in Kuwait.

For Cuba, respect for and full implementation of Security Council resolutions 662 (1990) and 664 (1990) remain an imperative necessity.

Our vote should also be understood as an expression of friendship and respect for France, Canada and the other States whose diplomatic personnel and missions have been and are the object of actions and incidents that Cuba can only reject.

Mr. TADESSE (Ethiopia): The Security Council has been convened once again to consider one of the most serious implications of Iraq's occupation of Kuwait - namely, the violation of the premises of some foreign missions in occupied Kuwait City.

The actions taken by Iraq, in violation of the basic norms governing diplomatic and consular missions, not only reveal Iraq's defiance of the relevant resolutions of the Security Council but also constitute yet another attempt by Iraq to consolidate its annexation of Kuwait. Taking place as they do at a moment when the international community continues to express its grave concern over the plight of the civilian population in Kuwait and the safety of third-country nationals, these actions are bound to aggravate an already tense situation.

As these illegal actions continue to challenge and test the will of the Security Council - indeed, that of the international community - it is only

(Mr. Tadesse, Ethiopia)

appropriate that the Council has acted on this crucial issue in the most expeditious manner.

We view the adoption of resolution 667 (1990) as an initial step to confront the flagrant violations committed by Iraq against diplomatic missions in occupied Kuwait. As these incidents we have considered are not isolated cases, the resolution we have just adopted provides only our initial reaction to the serious situation. It is our conviction that the Council will further consult on the matter, with a view to taking the necessary measures to compel Iraq to comply with all the relevant resolutions of the Security Council, and to ensure Iraq's strict adherence to the rules of international law.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): The Council will now hear other statements.

I invite the representative of Italy to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. TRAXLER (Italy): As the Council is aware, Italy and other countries members of the European Community also requested this immediate meeting of the Security Council, in support of the request submitted by France. In so doing, Italy and other members of the European Community are acting in pursuance of numerous decisions taken by their Ministers, one of which, in particular, stated that

> "Any attempt to harm or jeopardize the safety of any European Community citizen will be considered as a most grave offence directed against the Community and all its member States and will provoke a united response from the entire Community."

It follows that the offence against the French Embassy is regarded as an offence against all members of the Community.

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

The Twelve are fully aware of the suffering that Mr. Saddam Hussein's policy of invasion and annihilation of an independent, sovereign State is imposing on hundreds of thousands of human beings. Indeed, it is well known that the Community and its member States responded immediately to the plight of these human beings and are to this day the most generous providers of assistance to the people rendered homeless by the reckless policy of Mr. Saddam Hussein.

But, at the same time, the members of the European Community cannot ignore the violations of the basic rules of civilized relationships perpetrated by Iraq. In the first place, Iraq violated the fundamental rights of foreign residents both in its country and in Kuwait. Then the Iraqi authorities grievously interfered in the actions, life and very existence of foreign embassies in Kuwait. And, finally, they physically attacked these embassies, whose reasons for being include the protection of their own nationals. This particular offence must, in our view, elicit an immediate response, because it affects the very bases of intercourse between nations.

Quite recently President Saddam Hussein tried to single out Iraq as the cradle of civilization, going back to Hammurabi, the great legislator. We do not claim to go back so far. We would like him to respect some more recent conventions, some more-recent rules of behaviour, including the Vienna Conventions, because these are really at the root of the existence of this very Organization, the existence of this building. Our ability to address you, Mr. President, to listen to other States, to respect everybody's point of view rests on respect by all the members of the international community for certain rules of behaviour.

That is why, in Italy's view, Iraq's action against the embassies in Kuwait must elicit a response not just from the individual countries against which the

(Mr. Traxler, Italy)

offence has been committed, but from the whole international community as represented in the Security Council - for Iraq's action constitutes an offence against the whole international community.

For those reasons, Italy fully supports the measures contained in resolution 667 (1990), just adopted. In particular, we sincerely support paragraph 5, calling upon Iraq to respect the Council's previous resolutions. Should this not happen, we are prepared to support further actions which the Council may take under paragraph 6 of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I now call on the representative of Kuwait.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): Once again we are meeting at a late hour to discuss a thoroughly extraordinary situation resulting from the continued Iraqi aggression against and occupation of Kuwait. It is an occupation against which the international community has adopted a unified position, completely isolating Iraq from the civilized world.

The events we are considering today are the continuation of a series of illegal acts committed by the occupation forces of the Iraqi aggressor. Not only have the Iraqi forces of aggression violated the sanctity of the homes of diplomatic personnel; Iraq has also violated the sanctity of a country and its sovereignty. Iraq has violated international instruments, the Vienna Conventions on diplomatic relations and consular relations.

The Council of Ministers of the State of Kuwait, at a meeting yesterday, stated that it had

> "examined with concern and indignation the barbaric acts committed by the brutal forces of the Iraqi aggressor against foreign diplomatic personnel in Kuwait, which constitutes a flagrant violation of the Vienna Conventions on diplomatic relations and diplomatic communities. The Minister has also condemned the violation of embassies in Kuwait.
>
> "The Minister of Foreign Affairs of Kuwait and the Foreign Affairs Council, while denouncing Iraq's deeds, call upon the international community firmly to oppose Iraq's actions and to put an end to them. We refer to the barbaric deeds of Iraq which seek to undermine international order and the norms of international law."

The act of aggression against the embassies in Kuwait is merely the continuation of Iraq's aggression against the Kuwaiti Embassy in Baghdad and the

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

detention of the Ambassador and the Kuwaiti personnel of that Embassy, who were thrown into prison and remain there.

Iraq's act of aggression is only the continuation of a series of barbaric and inhuman crimes perpetrated by the Iraqi occupation forces on a day-to-day basis in Kuwait, against the Kuwaiti people and residents of Kuwait.

These actions deserve the Council's most vigorous condemnation. These actions deserve the adoption of further measures to oppose the Iraqi invader.

These actions are the result of the continued occupation of Kuwait. That is why the Security Council is called upon to consider, especially, the need to put an end to the occupation of Kuwait. The Security Council is called upon to tighten the vice by every possible means and procedure without discrimination to compel Iraq to comply with the Council's resolutions, withdraw its troops from Kuwaiti territory entirely and enable the legitimate Government of Kuwait to resume its rightful place and continue in the generous tradition of the Kuwaiti State.

Allow me once again to express Kuwait's appreciation to all States that have faced up to the difficulties imposed by Iraq, those countries that have thus far kept their Embassies open in Kuwait. We should like also to express our appreciation to the Security Council, which continues to keep under consideration the situation between Iraq and Kuwait and Iraq's occupation of Kuwait with a sense of responsibility, firmness and persistence in pursuing the need to apply the provisions of the Charter.

In so doing, the Council stands as a bulwark in defence of peace and security. I thank the Council and convey my deep admiration.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): I call on the representative of Iraq.

Mr. KADRAT (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): With a swiftness that is hardly its custom, the Security Council has been adopting resolution after resolution and imposing sanctions against Iraq and its people, depriving them of a normal life, medicines and foodstuffs, in contradiction of the most elementary and basic humanitarian principles. It would have done better to act with the same swiftness to implement its resolutions concerning Israel and the occupied territories, which have been completely ignored by the Israeli occupation forces in recent years without the Council's even moving its little finger.

(Mr. Kadrat, Iraq)

The news of the claimed intrusion into the residence of the French Ambassador is completely false and unfounded. The actual instructions given to the local authorities in the province of Kuwait are very clear. These instructions stipulate that these residences should not be entered, although they no longer have diplomatic immunity. What happened is that a French national who had been working as a counsellor in the French Embassy - an ex-counsellor of the French Ambassador - was in the house of one of the members of the Royal Family. After having been identified, he was taken to the residence of the French Ambassador. Nothing was done to him.

It is very clear that the measures announced by the French Government today are unjustifiable. If one looks at the French political scene, one will understand that the French Government was looking for a pretext to escalate the situation and to justify its colonialist-expansionist policy, which depends upon a tie-in with United States policy. Thus France has tried to create unfounded tension.

Iraq, which has had long and friendly relations with France, did nothing against France, the French Government, the French people or French nationals resident in Iraq. Moreover, French nationals - the elderly and those who are ill - have received Iraq's permission to depart as of 17 September. France is fully responsible for the escalation of the situation, with all its ramifications and consequences.

As everyone knows, Iraq's position is clear: our country respects the Vienna Conventions on Diplomatic and Consular Relations. Even in Kuwait City, Iraq has taken into account the humanitarian considerations involved, to the extent that this does not contradict security requirements. That is why it is clear that the resolution the Council has just adopted is one which will in no way promote a peaceful solution.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I wish to speak in exercise of the right of reply. I shall be brief.

The facts speak for themselves. The truth cannot be camouflaged. The Council has given its answer; it has, quite rightly, just unanimously condemned the new act of aggression committed by Iraq.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Russian): We have heard the last speaker for this meeting.

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda. It will remain seized of the matter.

The meeting rose at 3.35 a.m.